arXiv:math/9503206v1 [math.LO] 13 Mar 1995

Completeness Proof of Functional Logic,
A Formalism with Variable-Binding Nonlogical Symbols

Schönbrunner Josef
Institut für Logistik der Universität Wien
Universitätsstraae 10/11, A-1090 Wien (Austria)
e-mail a8121dab@helios.edvz.univie.ac.at

Abstract

We know extensions of first order logic by quantifiers of the kind "there are uncountable many ...", "most ..." with new axioms and appropriate semantics. Related are operations such as "set of x, such that ...", Hilbert's ε-operator, Churche's λ-notation, minimization and similar ones, which also bind a variable within some expression, the meaning of which is however partly defined by a translation into the language of first order logic. In this paper a generalization is presented that comprises arbitrary variable-binding symbols as non-logical operations. The axiomatic extension is determined by new equality-axioms; models allocate functionals to variable-binding symbols. The completeness of this system of the so called *functional logic of 1st order* will be proved.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 03C80, 03B99.

1 Introduction

Functional logic is a generalization of first order predicate logic with different kinds of objects by adding the following new features:

1. The division of expressions into the categories of sentences and individuals (i.e. *formulas* and *terms*) is weakened as with a differentiation of sorts of terms formulas shall also be treated as a sort. Thus the classification of the symbolic entities into *logical connectives*, *predicate symbols*, *function symbols* loses its significance, as the membership to one of it depends only on its signature (i.e. number and sorts of the argument-places and sort of the resulting expression). The sentential sort (formulas) retains its special role and will be refered to as $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. Thus the signature of a binary connective is '$\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{\pi},\boldsymbol{\pi})$', that of a $\mathfrak{n}$-ary predicate symbol '$\boldsymbol{\pi}(\alpha_1,...,\alpha_\mathfrak{n})$', that of a $\mathfrak{n}$-ary function symbol '$\gamma(\alpha_1,...,\alpha_\mathfrak{n})$' and that of a constant symbol 'γ', if each $\alpha_\mathfrak{i}$ and 'γ' are sorts. Not to be found in predicate logic are symbolic entities whose argument-places are mixed, partly of sort $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and partly of another object-sort. These do not fit

into any of the categories of *logical connectives*, *predicate symbols* or *function symbols* mentioned above. An example is the expression '?(E, a, b)' denoting an object "a if E, b otherwise", which is built up by a symbolic entity '?' of the signature '$\alpha(\pi, \alpha, \alpha)$'.

2. In a formalized theory of predicate logic expressions such as $\{x \mid E\}$, $\{x \in M \mid E\}$, $\iota x(E)$, $\varepsilon x(E)$, $\mu x(E)$, $\underset{x<b}{\mu x}(E)$, $\int_a^b e \cdot dx$ are characterized only by an external rule of translation into the language of the theory. In functional logic, however, such expressions can be generated internally by symbolic entities that bind variables. This is the essential extension of this formalism.

In standardized symbolisation a symbolic entity 'op' of the resulting sort γ with k argument places of signature$(\alpha_i\ ,\ \vec{\beta}_i)$, $\vec{\beta}_i = (\beta_{ij})_{j:1..r_i(1\le i\le k)}$ is linked with the generation rule by which

'op' if $k = 0$ (constant or variable) – or –
'op(.., $\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{q}_i) :]}\ a_i$, ..)' if $k > 0$

is an expression of sort γ, if each a_i is an expression of sort α_i and each $\vec{q}_i = (q_{ij})_{j:1..r_i}$ is a sequence of variables of sorts-sequence $\vec{\beta}_i = (\beta_{ij})_{j:1..r_i}$. The case $r_i = 0$ means that the optional part, which is written as $\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[.....]}$, is to be dropped. This case applies to *logical connectives*, *predicate symbols* and *function symbols* in all argument-places i, only quantifiers have a signature '$\pi((\alpha) : \pi)$' with $r_1 = 1$. Putting the template $\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[.....]}$ around something is used to consider both cases $r_i = 0$ as well as $r_i > 0$. If $r_i > 0$ the brackets can be erased and '$\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{q}_i) :]}\ a_i$' stands for '$(\vec{q}_i) : a_i$', which is an abbreviation of '$(q_{i1}, \dots, q_{ir_i}) : a_i$'. '$q_{i,j}$' are the binding variables to 'a_i'.

Examples: 1. The extension of a formal Peano-system by axioms like

$$\mathrm{Apl}_k((x_1, \dots, x_k) : e, a_1, \dots, a_k) = e\,{}^{x_1..x_k}_{a_1..a_k}\ ,$$

$$\mathrm{PR}(a, (y, z) : b, n) = ?(n{=}0,\ a,\ \mathrm{Apl}_2((y, z) : b,\ n-1,\ \mathrm{PR}(a, (y, z) : b, n-1)))$$

allows the representation of each primitive recursive function by a single term. (In the above schemes of axioms e, a, b, a_i range over arbitrary terms and n is a number variable.) If all free variables of a and b which are not members of {'y', 'z'} are in {'u_1', ..., 'u_m'}, then the term 'PR$(a, (y, z) : b, n)$' can be associated with a $m+1$−ary function of arguments $u_1, ..., u_m, n$, defined by primitive recursion from *base-function* $\langle u_1, ..., u_m\rangle \mapsto a$ and *iteration-function* $\langle u_1, ..., u_m, y, z\rangle \mapsto b$.

2. Quantifiers to variables of different sorts must be distinguished, the signature of '$\forall^\alpha$' is '$\pi((\alpha) : \pi)$'. In standardized manner, a formula '$\forall x^\alpha\, E$' would be '$\forall^\alpha((x^\alpha) : E)$'.

3. A standardized version of expressing "the least x less than b such that E if one exists, or b if none exists" (usually symbolized by '$\underset{x<b}{\mu x}\ E$') is '$\mu_<(b, (x) : E)$', the signature of '$\mu_<$' being '$\nu(\nu, (\nu) : \pi)$' if ν is the sort of natural Numbers.

A standardized symbolic language and an ideal language for application with the same expressional ability are different. The first should be simple in order to avoid unnecessary expense in metatheoretic treatment. With regard to application this

simplicity can be disadvantageous. For instance in predicate calculus one symbol cannot be used with different signatures depending on the sorts of arguments it appears with. Such multiple use of a symbol became popular in programming languages, when looking at overloaded versions of procedure-names. Application of formal logics could profit from such a technique, too. For instance, consider sorts α, β and a class of models such that the range of β is a substructure of the range of α, if the signature of a symbol w.r.t a certain argument-place is of sort α, then any term of sort β also fits into that place. "overloading of symbols" may yield simpler axiom-schemes. Yet it requires change from the notion of *symbol* to that of *symbolic entity* (= symbol + signature). As a basis of meta-linguistic reference we shall take the standardized form. Results derived on this basis can easily be transferred into more flexible symbolism for practical use. Non standardized usages of writing such as that w.r.t. quantifiers shall be retained like alias clauses in our object language. Instead of overloading the various '$\forall^{\alpha}$' into one '$\forall$' and various '$\overset{\alpha}{=}$' to '$=$' we stipulate: '$\forall\, \mathfrak{x}$' stands for '$\forall^{\alpha}\, \mathfrak{x}$' if '$\mathfrak{x}$' $\in \mathrm{VAR}_{\alpha}$ and '$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$' stands for '$\mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{b}$' if '$\mathfrak{a}$', '$\mathfrak{b}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\gamma}$.

As to the logical axioms, the usual schemes of predicate calculus may be adapted, but *binding of variables* (significant to the axioms) is performed by symbols other than quantifiers, too. One part of the equality axioms become

$$(\forall z_{i\,1})...(\forall z_{i\,r_i})\,(\mathfrak{a}_i \tfrac{\vec{x_i}}{\vec{z_i}} \overset{\alpha_i}{=} \mathfrak{b}_i \tfrac{\vec{y_i}}{\vec{z_i}}) \;\rightarrow\; \mathrm{op}(..., \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{x_i}):]}\, \mathfrak{a}_i, ...) \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathrm{op}(..., \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{y_i}):]}\, \mathfrak{b}_i, ...)$$

where $\mathfrak{x}_i \equiv \mathfrak{x}_{i\,1}, ..., \mathfrak{x}_{i\,r_i}$, similarly $\mathfrak{y}_i, \mathfrak{z}_i$, and where $\mathfrak{a}_i \tfrac{\vec{x_i}}{\vec{z_i}}$ designates the expression obtained from $\mathfrak{a}_i$ by replacing each *free occurrence* of $\mathfrak{x}_{i\,j}$ by $\mathfrak{z}_{i\,j}$ (for $1 \le j \le r_i$) and $\mathrm{op}(..., \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{y_i}):]}\, \mathfrak{b}_i, ...)$ differs from $\mathrm{op}(..., \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{x_i}):]}\, \mathfrak{a}_i, ...)$ only by the i-th argument. Note: (1) if $r_i = 0$, then the above sequence of universal quantifiers becomes empty; (2) If $\gamma = \pi$ is the sentential sort, then $\overset{\pi}{=}$ is to be identified with $\leftrightarrow$ (=logical equivalence).

The main problem is introducing appropriate semantics to which the calculus is complete. Let "op" be a *symbol* with $k > 0$ argument places, at least one of them provides binding variables i.e. $r_i > 0$ for some $i : 1..k$. At first consideration we suppose an interpretation-structure to assign to 'op' the functional

$$\mathfrak{M}(\text{'op'}) : \prod_{i:1..k} V_i \;\rightarrow\; \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma}\,, \qquad V_i = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i} & \text{if} \quad r(i) = 0 \\ \mathrm{Map}(\prod\limits_{j:1..r_i} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta_{i\,j}}\,, \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i}) & \text{if} \quad r(i) > 0 \end{cases}$$

($\mathfrak{M}_{\gamma}$ is the range of γ and $\mathrm{Map}(X, Y) = \{f \mid f : X \to Y\} = Y^X$). But this turns out to fix too much, as assignment only to a part of the functions of $\mathrm{Map}(\prod\limits_{j:1..r_i} \mathfrak{M}_{\beta_{i\,j}}\,, \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i})$ will be relevant for evaluation of expressions. Nothing beyond that partial assignment you may expect to come out from the *syntactic information of a consistent theory.* To overcome this problem a certain restriction of the argument ranges V_i will help. The notion of a structure $\mathfrak{M}$ must therefore be extended by a new component which assigns a selected set $\mathfrak{M}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\gamma} \subseteq \mathrm{Map}(\prod\limits_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_i}, \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma})$ to each sequence of sorts $\gamma, \vec{\sigma}$. The selected sets are characterized by some *closure qualities* similar to those that apply to the set of (primitive-) recursive functions, for instance constant functions and projections are to be included. In a trivial way, however, we find an extension $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ of $\mathfrak{M}$ so that $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\gamma} = \mathrm{Map}(\prod\limits_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_i}, \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma})$ and the *interpretations of expressions* by $\mathfrak{M}$ and by $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$

coincide as well as the *semantic consequences* $\mathfrak{M} \models$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{M}} \models$. To construct a model of a *consistent formal theory* the method of extension to a *complete Henkin Theory* as in Henkin's Proof of the Completeness Theorem s. [HEN49, SHO67] is still applicable.

2 Survey

As basic structure of a 1st order functional logic language we define the Fnl^1 signature. Then a standardized language is specified that determines the notion of an expression 'e' of sort γ. This is defined inductively by a characteristic syntactic relation of 'e' to a symbol 'op' (the root of 'e'), argument expressions 'a_i' and possibly variables 'v_{ij}' binding 'a_i'. As this relation shall frequently appear as a background premise within definitions and proofs constantly using the same arguments 'e','op','a_i' and 'v_{ij}', we introduce the abbreviation Generation-Premise. The definition of a Fnl^1-structure is based on the notion of a Fnl^1 signature according to features discussed in the introduction. We shall only consider logic with *fixed equality* base on *normal structure semantics*. To derive semantics for the language from the notion of structure based on a signature, that is to establish an interpretation of the expressions (of various sorts), the usual definition as a map from *variables-assignments* to the domain of the sort the expression belongs to is not suitable. Instead of it now an expression 'e' will be evaluated according to a Fnl^1 structure $\mathfrak{M}$ by assigning a mapping on the set of the so called perspectives of 'e' consisting of all finite sequences of variables, such that all free variables of 'e' appear within that sequence. Let γ be the resulting sort of 'e'. The evaluation of 'e' based on $\mathfrak{M}$ maps the empty sequence $\langle\rangle$ into a member of the range $\mathfrak{M}_\gamma$ of γ, provided that $\langle\rangle$ is a *perspective* of 'e' (i.e. if 'e' has no free variable) and it maps a non-empty perspective $\langle$'u_1', ... , 'u_m'$\rangle$ of 'e' into a function of $\mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_1} \times \ldots \times \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_m} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_\gamma$, if σ_j is the sort of the variable 'u_j' $(j=1,\ldots m)$. The definition will be *inductive* based on the background-assumption of Generation-Premise.

As to the *axiomatization*, the *logical axioms* differ in shape from predicate logic only a little with regard to *equality logic*. But we must also take into account an extension of some notions which are basic to formulate axioms of logic, namely the notions of free and bound variables, substitution and substitutability. The *axioms system* together with the *rules* Modus Ponens and Generalization establishes the *calculus of Functional Logic*. The extension of this calculus by individual *nonlogical axioms* is called a *functional logic theory*. A Fnl^1 structure-model of a *consistent functional logic theory* can be constructed as in predicate logic from an extension of that theory which inherits consistency, admits examples and is complete. (*admitting examples* is related to the existence of terms t for each formula φ with at most one free variable x, so that $\exists x\ \varphi \ \rightarrow\ \varphi[x \leftarrow t]$ is a theorem; we associate this theorem to designate t as an example, if $\exists x\, \varphi$ is true.) In Henkin's proof this is achieved in two steps: The 1st extension produces a *theory* that admits examples by addition of constant symbols and *special axioms* (s. [HEN49, SHO67, BAR77]). Consistency continues as this extension is *conservative* (each theorem of the extended theory, if restricted to the original language, is also provable within the original theory). The 2nd extension by Lindenbaum's theorem enlarges the set of nonlogical axioms without changing the language. Both extensions can easily be adapted to functional logic. The definition of a *"term structure"*, which shall prove to be a model of the constructed extension to a *closed Henkin Theory* and hence also a model of the original theory,

also relies on a so called *norm function* that assigns a representative to each *closed expression* within a *congruence class*. This class will be defined by the congruence relation, that applies to '$\mathfrak{a}$' and '$\mathfrak{b}$' iff '$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$' is a theorem of the *extended theory*. As we suppose *completeness* of the *extended theory*, there are exactly two *congruence classes* of expressions of sort $\boldsymbol{\pi}$; hence we choose the constants $\curlywedge$ and $\curlyvee$ (representing *true* or *false* respectively) as values of the *norm function* of formulae. Upon the set of *norms* (i.e values of the *norm function*), which is a subset of *closed expressions* to each *sort* as *base-range*, we then define our so called *term-structure*. The model quality of this structure will be obtained as an immediate consequence of a theorem (by specialization). The claim of this theorem is that the *evaluation* of an expression '$\mathfrak{e}$' by the *term-structure* $\mathfrak{X}$ is a function which assigns to each *perspective* a mapping from a cartesian product of certain ranges $..\mathfrak{X}_{\sigma_i}..$ to $\mathfrak{X}_\gamma$, which can be described exclusively by application of *multiple substitution* (variables by terms) from '$\mathfrak{e}$' and application of the *norm function*. The validity of a formula (=expression of sort $\boldsymbol{\pi}$) within a model means that its interpretation maps one (and implicitly all) non-empty *perspectives* into a constant function of value $\mathfrak{M}(\curlyvee)$. In case of a closed formula this implies that the *empty perspective* is assigned the value $\mathfrak{M}(\curlyvee)$. If $\mathfrak{X}$ takes the place of $\mathfrak{M}$, $\mathfrak{M}(\curlyvee)$ changes into $\curlyvee$ $(= \mathfrak{X}(\curlyvee))$. By applying the preceding theorem to an '$\mathfrak{e}$' of sort $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and taking into account that *equality of the sort* $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and *logical equivalence* become one and the same ('$\overset{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{=}$' = '$\leftrightarrow$'), you easily conclude the equivalence of '$\mathfrak{e}$' *being valid in the term-model* and *being deducible in the extended theory*. As we refer to an *extension*, the restriction of $\mathfrak{X}$ to the language of the original theory is also a model of this theory. This confirms the *satisfiability* of that theory on the assumption of its *consistency*.

3 Signature and Language

3.1 Definition $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ \mathsf{S}$: The notion of "S is a signature of 1st-order functional logic" is determined by the following key-components: SRT_S: sorts; SOP_S: symbolic operations; VSRT_S: sorts for which variables and quantification are provided. VAR_S: variables; sign_S: signature map, sign_S 'op' $= \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}} \rangle$ for 'op' $\in \mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S} \cup \mathrm{VAR}_\mathsf{S}$ characterizes 'op' as a symbolic operation to generate expressions of sort γ from $\mathfrak{n}$ argument-expressions of sort α_i, that might be bound by $\mathfrak{r}_i$ variables of sorts $\beta_{i\,j}$. Significant for the notion to be defined is also a distinguished sort $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ (the type of formulae) and distinguished elements of SOP_S : '$\curlyvee$' , '$\curlywedge$' , '$\neg$' , '$\rightarrow$' , '$\wedge$' , '$\vee$' , '$\leftrightarrow$' , '$\forall^\alpha$' , '$\exists^\alpha$' (for each α of VSRT_S) and '$\overset{\alpha}{=}$' (for $\alpha \in \mathrm{SRT}_\mathsf{S}$) with fixed values relative to sign_S. In formalized manner now we stipulate all characterizations of this definition as follows:

$\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ \mathsf{S} \longleftrightarrow$ Conjunction of the following attributes :

$\mathsf{S} = (\mathrm{SRT}_\mathsf{S}, \mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S}, \mathrm{VSRT}_\mathsf{S}, \mathrm{VAR}_\mathsf{S}, \mathrm{sign}_\mathsf{S}) \qquad \mathrm{VSRT}_\mathsf{S} \subseteq \mathrm{SRT}_\mathsf{S} \qquad \mathrm{VAR}_\mathsf{S} \cap \mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S} = \varnothing$

$\mathrm{sign}_\mathsf{S} : (\mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S} \cup \mathrm{VAR}_\mathsf{S}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SRT}_\mathsf{S} \times \bigcup_{\mathfrak{m}} (\,\mathrm{SRT}^{\mathfrak{m}} \times \mathrm{VSRT}^{*\,\mathfrak{m}}\,)$

$(\forall\, \text{'}\nu\text{'} \in \mathrm{VAR}_\mathsf{S})\ \ \mathrm{sign}_\mathsf{S}\, \text{'}\nu\text{'} \in \mathrm{VSRT}_\mathsf{S} \times \{\langle\rangle\}^2 \qquad \mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S} \cup \mathrm{VAR}_\mathsf{S}$ can be well-ordered[1)]

$(\forall\, \alpha \in \mathrm{VSRT}_\mathsf{S})\ \big(\ \{\text{'}\nu\text{'} \in \mathrm{VAR}_\mathsf{S} \mid \mathrm{sign}_\mathsf{S}\, \text{'}\nu\text{'} = (\alpha, \langle\rangle, \langle\rangle)\}$ is enumerable $\big)$

$\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{SRT}_\mathsf{S} \qquad$ '$\curlyvee$' , '$\curlywedge$' , '$\neg$' , '$\rightarrow$' , '$\wedge$' , '$\vee$' , '$\leftrightarrow$' $\in \mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S}$

$(\forall\, \alpha \in \mathrm{VSRT}_\mathsf{S})$ '$\forall^\alpha$' , '$\exists^\alpha$' $\in \mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S} \qquad (\forall\, \alpha \in \mathrm{SRT}_\mathsf{S})$ '$\overset{\alpha}{=}$' $\in \mathrm{SOP}_\mathsf{S}$

$\underline{\text{sign}}_S$ for the distinguished members of SOP_S is specified by a circumscription $\underline{\text{sign}}_S$, (s. auxiliary notations below) :

op	$\curlyvee, \curlywedge$	$\neg$	$\rightarrow, \wedge, \vee, \leftrightarrow$	$\forall^\alpha, \exists^\alpha$	$\overset{\alpha}{=}$
$\underline{\text{sign}}_S$'op'	'π'	'$(\pi)\pi$'	'$(\pi,\pi)\pi$'	'$((\alpha)\pi)\pi$' for $\alpha \in \text{VSRT}_S$	'$(\alpha,\alpha)\pi$' for $\alpha \in \text{SRT}_S$

Auxilary Notations (dependent components) to a given Fnl^1 Signat S:

$(\forall\, \alpha \in \text{SRT}_S)\quad \text{COP}_S^\alpha = \{\text{'c'} \in \text{SOP}_S \mid \text{sign}_S\,\text{'c'} = (\alpha, \langle\rangle, \langle\rangle)\} \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \text{COP}_\alpha$ constants

$(\forall\, \alpha \in \text{VSRT}_S)\,\text{VAR}_S^\alpha = \{\text{'}\nu\text{'} \in \text{VAR}_S \mid \text{sign}_S\,\text{'}\nu\text{'} = (\alpha, \langle\rangle, \langle\rangle)\} \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \text{VAR}_\alpha$ variables

$(\forall\, \vec{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{i:1..l} \in \text{VSRT}^*)\quad \text{VAR}_S^{\vec{\sigma}} \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \text{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}} = \prod_{i:1..l} \text{VAR}_{\sigma_i} =$

$$= \{\vec{u} \mid \vec{u} = \langle u_i \rangle_{i:1..l} \wedge (\forall\, i : 1..l)\ \text{'}u_i\text{'} \in \text{VAR}_{\sigma_i}\}$$

For sign_S we use a circumscription that is more convenient for application:

$$\underline{\text{sign}}_S : \text{SOP}_S \cup \text{VAR}_S \rightarrow (\text{SRT}_S \cup \{\text{'('}, \text{','}, \text{')'}\})^* \qquad (\forall\, \text{'op'} \in \text{SOP}_S \cup \text{VAR}_S)$$

$$\text{sign}_S\,\text{'op'} = \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}} \rangle \quad \text{iff}$$

$$\underline{\text{sign}}_S\,\text{'op'} = \begin{cases} \text{'}\gamma\text{'} & \text{if } m = 0 \\ \text{'}(\theta_1, .., \theta_m)\gamma\text{'} & \text{if } m > 0 \end{cases} \qquad \text{'}\theta_i\text{'} = \begin{cases} \text{'}\alpha_i\text{'} & \text{if } r_i = 0 \\ \text{'}(\beta_{i\,1}, .., \beta_{i\,r_i})\alpha_i\text{'} & \text{if } r_i > 0 \end{cases}$$

I. Notational Clauses (1) Subscript S will be omitted (SRT for $\text{SRT}_S, ..., \text{VAR}_\alpha$ for VAR_S^α) if only one Fnl^1 Signat is considered. (2) $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, ..., \alpha_i, \beta_{ij}, ...$ denote members of SRT. (3) $u, ..., z,\ u_i, ..., \nu_{ij}, ...$ denote members of VAR. (4) Symbols with an arrow-accent refer to a finite sequence and writing such symbols one after the other denotes the concatenation of the sequences (if $\vec{p} = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_k \rangle$ and $\vec{q} = \langle q_1, \ldots, q_l \rangle$ then $\vec{p}\vec{q} = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_k, q_1, \ldots, q_l \rangle$). (5) If such a symbol e.g. $\vec{u}$ appears inside a quoted string, as for instance 'op$((\vec{u}) : a)$', it denotes the string '$u_1, \ldots, u_l$', which is the concatenation of each 'u_i' with ',' interspearsed. (6) We shall always assume $\vec{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_i \rangle_{i:1..m}$, $\vec{\vec{\beta}} = \langle \vec{\beta}_i \rangle_{i:1..m}$, $\vec{\beta_i} = \langle \beta_{i\,j} \rangle_{j:1..r_i}$.

3.2 Definition $\left(\mathfrak{L}_S^\gamma\right)_{\gamma \in \text{SRT}_S}$ Let S be a Fnl^1 Signat . The *standardized language* of S is introduced as a mapping on SRT_S by stipulating for each $\gamma \in \text{SRT}_S$ the set $\mathfrak{L}_S^\gamma$ of expressions of sort γ inductively as follows (by above clause (1) $\mathfrak{L}_\gamma \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \mathfrak{L}_S^\gamma$):

$$\text{'}e\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma \leftrightarrow (\exists\, \text{'op'}, m, \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}}, \vec{a}, \vec{\vec{\nu}})(\mathsf{Generation\text{-}Premise})$$

[1] This is needed only to prove completeness independent of the *axiom of choice*.

where Generation-Premise abbreviates the conjunction of the following formulae:

$$\text{`op'} \in \text{SOP} \cup \text{VAR} \qquad \text{sign `op'} = \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}} \rangle$$
$$\vec{\alpha} \in \text{SRT}^m \qquad \vec{\vec{\beta}} \in \prod_{i:1..m} \text{VSRT}^{r_i} \qquad (\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}} \text{ rely on above I.(6)})$$
$$\vec{a} = \langle \text{`} a_i \text{'} \rangle_{i:1..m} \in \prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i} \qquad (\text{each } \text{`} a_i \text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}) \qquad \vec{\vec{\nu}} = \langle \vec{\nu}_i \rangle_{i:1..m} \in \prod_{i:1..m} \text{VAR}_{\vec{\beta}_i}$$
$$\forall i \ \left(\vec{\nu_i} = \langle \text{`} \nu_{i\,j} \text{'} \rangle_{j:1..r_i} \ \wedge \ (\forall\, 1 \le j < k \le r_i \,) \ \text{`} \nu_{i\,j} \text{'} \neq \text{`} \nu_{i\,k} \text{'} \right)$$
$$\text{`} e \text{'} = \begin{cases} \text{`op'} & \text{if } m = 0 \\ \text{`op}(\ldots, [(\vec{\nu_i}) :]_{\text{if } r_i > 0}\ a_i, \ldots)\text{'} & \text{if } m > 0 \end{cases}$$

This definition characterizes the expression ‘e’ as a chain of symbols which is produced by a symbolic operation ‘op’ either exclusively (constant or variable) or together with argument-expressions ‘a_i’ $(i : 1 .. m)$ possibly accompanied by binding variables $\vec{\nu_i}$ (‘e’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ is composed of smaller expressions ‘a_i’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}$).

In predicate logic binding variables $\vec{\nu_i}$ are only provided for the two quantifiers, but expressions which are built up by another symbol ‘op’ are either of shape ‘op’ or ‘op$(a_1, .., a_m)$’. Even in application of functional logic binding variables will be rare and never appear in front of more than one argument of a symbolic operation. The above definition is a prerequisite to almost all remaining conceptions of this article, always refering to the formula abbreviated by Generation-Premise.

3.3 Definition $\mathfrak{L}_S = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \text{SRT}} \mathfrak{L}_\gamma \qquad (\ \vec{\sigma} \in \text{SRT}^\ell\ ) \quad \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\sigma}} = \prod_{i:1..\ell} \mathfrak{L}_{\sigma_i}$

4 Semantics of Functional Logic

4.1 Definition Fnl^1 Structure$_S$ $\mathfrak{M}$: $\mathfrak{M}$ is a Fnl^1-*type normal structure* of *signature* S, iff the following conditions apply to it:

i) Fnl^1 Signat $S = (\text{SRT}, \text{SOP}, \text{VSRT}, \text{VAR}, \text{sign})$

ii) $\mathfrak{M}$ is a mapping defined on $\text{SRT} \cup (\text{SRT} \times \text{VSRT}^*) \cup \text{SOP}$. This mapping assigns elements of SRT to corresponding ranges, members of SOP to symbol-interpretations (i.e. corresponding elements of or functions on such ranges or functionals in case of symbols that bind variables). To ordered pairs of $\text{SRT} \times \text{VSRT}^*$ it assigns those components which determine the classes of functions admitted as arguments of the letter functionals.

1) $(\forall\, \alpha \in \text{SRT}\,) \quad \mathfrak{M}(\alpha) \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \mathfrak{M}_\alpha \neq \varnothing$ and we automatically extend $\mathfrak{M}$ to SRT^*:
$(\forall\, \vec{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in \text{SRT}^*\,) \quad \mathfrak{M}(\vec{\sigma}) \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \mathfrak{M}_{\vec{\sigma}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i:1..\ell} \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_i}$

2) $(\forall\, \text{`op'} \in \text{SOP}\,,\ \text{sign `op'} = \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}} \rangle\,) \quad (\text{using} \quad \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\beta}_i} \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \mathfrak{M}(\alpha_i, \vec{\beta}_i))$
if $m = 0$ then $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{`op'} \in \mathfrak{M}_\gamma$, otherwise $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{`op'} : \prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\beta}_i} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_\gamma$

3) For arbitrary $\gamma \in \text{SRT}\,,\ \vec{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in \text{VSRT}^\ell$

3.1) $\ell = 0 \;\rightarrow\; \mathfrak{M}(\gamma, \vec{\sigma}) \;=\; \mathfrak{M}(\gamma, \langle\rangle) \;= \mathfrak{M}_\gamma$
$\ell > 0 \;\rightarrow\; \mathfrak{M}(\gamma, \vec{\sigma}) \;\subseteq\; \mathrm{Map}(\mathfrak{M}_{\vec{\sigma}}, \mathfrak{M}_\gamma) \;\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\mathfrak{M}_{\vec{\sigma}}}$
alias notation: $\mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{M}(\gamma, \vec{\sigma})$

completion qualities of $\mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$:

3.2) $(\forall\, \mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{M}_\gamma\,)\ \mathrm{cst}_{\mathbf{w}}^{\vec{\sigma}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathfrak{M}\gamma \\ \vec{\mathbf{x}} & \mapsto & \mathbf{w} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$ (constant funcs.)

$(\forall\, \mathsf{j} : 1\,..\,\ell\,)\ \mathrm{pj}_{\mathsf{j}}^{\vec{\sigma}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathfrak{M}\sigma_{\mathsf{j}} \\ \langle \mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{i}} \rangle_{\mathsf{i}} & \mapsto & \mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{j}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\sigma_{\mathsf{j}}}^{\vec{\sigma}}$ (projections)

3.3) $(\forall\, \vec{\rho} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^*\,)\ (\forall\, \vec{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathfrak{M}\vec{\sigma}\,)\ \forall\, \mathbf{g}$

if $\mathbf{g} \in \mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}\vec{\rho}}$ then $\mathbf{g}_{\vec{\mathbf{x}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\vec{\rho} & \to & \mathfrak{M}\gamma \\ \vec{\mathbf{r}} & \mapsto & \mathbf{g}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}\vec{\mathbf{r}}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\vec{\rho}}$ (partial fixing)

3.4) $(\forall\, \text{‘op’} \in \mathrm{SOP}\,,\ \mathrm{sign}\,\text{‘op’} = \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \overrightarrow{\beta} \rangle\,)\ (\forall\, \mathbf{g}_1, ..., \mathbf{g}_m\,)$
the premises $m > 0\,,\ \ell > 0$ and
$(\forall\, \mathsf{i} : 1\,..\,m\,)\quad \mathbf{g}_{\mathsf{i}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_{\mathsf{i}}}^{\vec{\sigma}\vec{\beta}_{\mathsf{i}}}$ and introducing the auxiliary notation:

$$\mathbf{h}_{\mathsf{i}} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_{\mathsf{i}} & \text{if } r_{\mathsf{i}} = 0 \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathrm{Map}(\mathfrak{M}\vec{\beta}_{\mathsf{i}}\,,\ \mathfrak{M}\alpha_{\mathsf{i}}\,) \\ \vec{\mathbf{y}} & \mapsto & \mathbf{g}_{\mathsf{i}\vec{\mathbf{y}}} = [\vec{\mathbf{z}} \mapsto \mathbf{g}_{\mathsf{i}}(\vec{\mathbf{y}}\vec{\mathbf{z}})] \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } r_{\mathsf{i}} > 0 \quad (3.3 \text{ implies } \mathbf{h}_{\mathsf{i}}\vec{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_{\mathsf{i}}}^{\vec{\beta}_{\mathsf{i}}}) \end{cases}$$

imply

$\begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathfrak{M}\gamma \\ & \mapsto & \vec{\mathbf{y}} \end{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘op’}\,(\mathbf{h}_1(\vec{\mathbf{y}}), \ldots, \mathbf{h}_m(\vec{\mathbf{y}})) \in \mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$ (composition)

What $\mathfrak{M}$ assigns to the fixed components of S :

4) $\mathfrak{M}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} = \{\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\lrcorner\text{’}\,,\ \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\curlyvee\text{’}\,\} = \mathbb{B} = \{\mathbf{0}_{\mathfrak{B}}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}\}$ and
$\langle \mathfrak{M}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}, \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\lrcorner\text{’}, \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\curlyvee\text{’}, \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\neg\text{’}, \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\wedge\text{’}, \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\vee\text{’}\,\rangle = \mathfrak{B} = \langle \mathbb{B}, \mathbf{0}_{\mathfrak{B}}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}, \overline{\ }_{\mathfrak{B}}, \sqcap_{\mathfrak{B}}, \sqcup_{\mathfrak{B}} \rangle$
forms a Boolean algebra with two elements, $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\|\to\|\text{’}$ and $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\|\leftrightarrow\|\text{’}$ are represented by the (dependent) truth-operations $\dashv\!\exists_{\mathfrak{B}}$ und $\vdash\!\dashv_{\mathfrak{B}}$. $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\forall^\alpha\text{’}$ and $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\exists^\alpha\text{’}$ are defined for $\alpha \in \mathrm{VSRT}$ as follows:
$\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\forall^\alpha\text{’}\,,\ \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\exists^\alpha\text{’} : \mathfrak{M}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{\langle\alpha\rangle} \to \mathfrak{M}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ for each $\theta \in \mathfrak{M}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{\langle\alpha\rangle}$ we stipulate
if $(\forall\, \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{M}_\alpha)\ \theta\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle = \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ then $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\forall^\alpha\text{’}\,(\theta) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ otherwise $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\forall^\alpha\text{’}\,(\theta) = \mathbf{0}_{\mathfrak{B}}$;
if $(\exists\, \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{M}_\alpha)\ \theta\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle = \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ then $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\exists^\alpha\text{’}\,(\theta) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ otherwise $\mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\exists^\alpha\text{’}\,(\theta) = \mathbf{0}_{\mathfrak{B}}$.

5) $(\forall\, \alpha \in \mathrm{SRT}\,)\quad \mathfrak{M}\,\text{‘}\stackrel{\alpha}{=}\text{’} : \mathfrak{M}_{\langle\alpha\,,\,\alpha\rangle} \to \mathfrak{M}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\,, \quad \langle \mathbf{x}\,,\,\mathbf{y}\rangle \mapsto \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ if $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ or $\mathbf{0}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ otherwise

To extend a *structure* $\mathfrak{M}$ into an *interpretation* of the language, i.e. to find an *evaluation* of *expressions* $\mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ another approach than that based on *variables-assignments* as in *predicate logic* is required. The following definitions are prerequisites for the new approach.

4.2 Definition $\mathrm{persp}\colon \mathfrak{L}_{\mathsf{S}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{VAR}^*)$ (Let $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ \mathsf{S}\,,\ \mathfrak{L}_{\mathsf{S}} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \mathrm{SRT}} \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$)

For ‘$\mathfrak{e}$’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\mathsf{S}}$, $\mathrm{persp}\,\text{‘}\mathfrak{e}\text{’}$ denotes the set of all $\langle\, \text{‘}\mathfrak{u}_{\mathsf{i}}\text{’}\,\rangle_{\mathsf{i}:1..\ell} \in \mathrm{VAR}^*$ such that all free variables of ‘$\mathfrak{e}$’ are in $\{\, \text{‘}\mathfrak{u}_{\mathsf{i}}\text{’} \mid 1 \le \mathsf{i} \le \ell\}$.

We shall need a more technical approach in defining this conception using *syntactic induction*. If Generation-Premise (Def. 3.2 on page 6) is assumed, then persp ‘e’ depends on persp ‘a_i’ as follows:

cases		persp ‘e’ =
$m = 0$	‘op’ $\in$ VAR	$\{\langle$ ‘u_i’ $\rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in \text{VAR}^* \mid (\exists j : 1..\ell)$ ‘op’ = ‘u_j’ $\}$
	‘op’ $\notin$ VAR	VAR^*
$m > 0$		$\{\vec{u} \in \text{VAR}^* \mid (\forall i : 1..m)\ \vec{u}\vec{v_i} \in \text{persp ‘}a_i\text{’}\}$

4.3 Definition (Let Fnl^1 Signat S, $\vec{u} \in \text{VAR}^*$)

($\gamma \in \text{SRT}$) $\mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{u}] = \{$ ‘e’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma \mid \vec{u} \in \text{persp ‘}e\text{’}\}$ ($\vec{\sigma} \in \text{SRT}^\ell$) $\mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\sigma}}[\vec{u}] = \prod_{i:1..\ell} \mathfrak{L}_{\sigma_i}[\vec{u}]$

$\mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{u}]$ is the set of expressions of $\mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ whose free variables are among $\{$ ‘u_i’ $\mid i : 1..\ell\}$ if $\vec{u} = \langle$ ‘u_i’ $\rangle_{i:1..\ell}$. $\mathfrak{L}_\gamma[]$ therefore is the set of *closed $\gamma-$expressions.*

4.4 Observation (for Fnl^1 Signat S): $\mathfrak{L}_\gamma = \bigcup_{\vec{u} \in \text{VAR}^*} \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{u}]$

4.5 Observation (for Fnl^1 Signat S $\vec{u} = \langle$ ‘u_i’ $\rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in \text{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}}$ $\vec{\sigma} \in \text{VSRT}^*$):

$$\text{‘}e\text{’} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{u}] \ \leftrightarrow\ (\exists\, \text{‘op’}, m, \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \overrightarrow{\beta}, \vec{a}, \overrightarrow{\nu})(\text{persp.GP})$$

where persp.GP (=perspective G.P.) can be obtained from Generation-Premise (p. 6) by modification of two conditions: if we change ‘op’ $\in \text{SOP} \cup \text{VAR}$ into ‘op’ $\in \text{SOP} \cup \cup \{$ ‘u_i’ $\mid i : 1..\ell\}$ and $\vec{a} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ into $\vec{a} \in \prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}[\vec{u}\vec{v_i}]$ (each ‘a_i’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}[\vec{u}\vec{v_i}]$).

4.6 Definition Interpretation of the language into a structure

Let Fnl^1 Structure$_S$ $\mathfrak{M}$, $\gamma \in \text{SRT}$, ‘e’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ and Generation-Premise be assumed. The evaluation ‘e’$_{\mathfrak{M}}$ of ‘e’ is defined to be a function on persp ‘e’. Let $\vec{u} = \langle$ ‘u_i’ $\rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in$ persp ‘e’, $(\forall i : 1..\ell)$ sign ‘u_i’ = ‘σ_i’, $\vec{\sigma} = \langle\sigma_i\rangle_{i:1..m}$. Then ‘$e$’$_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{u})$ is defined inductively:

cases			‘e’$_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{u})$ =
$\ell = 0$	$m = 0$		$= \mathfrak{M}$‘op’
($\vec{u} = \langle\rangle$)	$m > 0$		$= \mathfrak{M}$‘op’$\big(\langle$ ‘a_i’$_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{v_i})\rangle_{i:1..m}\big)$
$\ell > 0$	$m = 0$	‘op’ $\in$ VAR	$= \text{pj}^{\vec{\sigma}}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathfrak{M}\sigma_k \\ \langle x_i\rangle_i & \mapsto & x_k \end{bmatrix}$ where $k = \max_{j:1..\ell} j(\text{‘}u_j\text{’} = \text{‘op’})$
		‘op’ $\in$ SOP	$= \text{cst}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\mathfrak{M}\text{‘op’}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathfrak{M}\gamma \\ \vec{x} & \mapsto & \mathfrak{M}\text{‘op’} \end{bmatrix}$
	$m > 0$		$= \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_{\vec{\sigma}} & \to & \mathfrak{M}_\gamma \\ \vec{x} & \mapsto & \mathfrak{M}\text{‘op’}(\langle h_i(\vec{x})\rangle_{i:1..m}) \end{bmatrix}$ with h_i defined below by *)

*) (case $\ell > 0, m > 0$)$(\forall i : 1..m)$ $h_i : \mathfrak{M}_{\vec{\sigma}} \to \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i}$, if $r_i = 0$: $h_i : \vec{x} \mapsto$ ‘a_i’$_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{u})(\vec{x})$

if $r_i > 0$ then $h_i : \vec{x} \mapsto \big($ ‘a_i’$_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{u}\vec{v_i})\big)_{\vec{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_{\vec{\beta_i}} & \to & \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i} \\ \vec{y} & \mapsto & \text{‘}a_i\text{’}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{u}\vec{v_i})(\vec{x}\vec{y}) \end{bmatrix}$.

4.7 Proposition $\quad \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{\mathfrak{u}}] \ \wedge \ \vec{\sigma} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^* \ \wedge \ \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}} \ \rightarrow \ \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{\mathfrak{u}}) \in \mathfrak{M}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$

Proof (+ Remark). This proposition is already required for the argument expressions '$\mathfrak{a}_i$' of the preceding definition (4.6) to assert that $\langle \mathbf{h}_i(\vec{\mathbf{x}})\rangle_{i:1..m}$ belongs to the domain of $\mathfrak{M}$'op' (this assertion also requires (3.3) of 4.1 *def.*). Conditions 4.1(3) imply that the above *proposition* propagates from the '$\mathfrak{a}_i$' to '$\mathfrak{e}$'; so *syntactic induction* ensures its validity and any circularity of 4.6 *def.* that might result from presupposing it (for $\mathfrak{a}_i$) is avoided as well. □

4.8 Observation If $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{N} \in \mathsf{Fnl}^1$ Structure $\quad (\forall\, \gamma \in \mathrm{SRT}\,)\ \mathfrak{M}_\gamma = \mathfrak{N}_\gamma$ and
$(\forall\, \text{`op'} \in \mathrm{SOP}\,, \mathrm{sign}\,\text{`op'} = \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}} \rangle\,)\ (\forall\, \vec{\mathbf{h}} \in \prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\beta_i}} \cap \prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{N}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\beta_i}}\,)\ \mathfrak{M}\text{`op'}(\vec{\mathbf{h}}) = \mathfrak{N}\text{`op'}(\vec{\mathbf{h}})$
$(\text{for } m = 0, \vec{\mathbf{h}} = \langle\rangle : \quad \mathfrak{M}\text{`op'}(\vec{\mathbf{h}}) = \mathfrak{N}\text{`op'}(\vec{\mathbf{h}})) \qquad \text{then } (\forall\, \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'} \in \bigcup_{\gamma \in \mathrm{SRT}} \mathfrak{L}_\gamma\,)\ \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\mathfrak{M}} = \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\mathfrak{N}}$

Proof. syntactic induction on '$\mathfrak{e}$' □

4.9 Conclusion If $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is characterized by $\forall\, \gamma\ \overline{\mathfrak{M}}_\gamma = \mathfrak{M}_\gamma \quad \forall\, \gamma, \vec{\sigma}\ \overline{\mathfrak{M}}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}} = \overline{\mathfrak{M}}_\gamma^{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{\vec{\sigma}}}$
and $\forall\, \text{`op'} \left(\prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{M}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\beta_i}}\right) \restriction \overline{\mathfrak{M}}\text{`op'} = \mathfrak{M}\text{`op'} \quad$ then $\quad (\forall\, \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'} \in \bigcup_{\gamma \in \mathrm{SRT}} \mathfrak{L}_\gamma\,)\ \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}} = \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\mathfrak{M}}.$

5 Syntactic Matters and the Calculus of Functional Logic

The *logical axioms* depend on the syntactic notions *free variables, bound variables* of an expression '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$, *substitutability* and *substitution* (of a variable in an expression for some term).

5.1 Notation $\lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{a}} \rfloor$ symbolizes the set of components of an arbitrary finite sequence $\vec{\mathfrak{a}}$ (if $\vec{\mathfrak{a}} = \langle \text{`}\mathfrak{a}_i\text{'} \rangle_{i:1..\ell}$, then $\lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{a}} \rfloor = \{\, \text{`}\mathfrak{a}_i\text{'} \mid i : 1..\ell \}$)

5.2 Definition frV '$\mathfrak{e}$' , bdV '$\mathfrak{e}$' (free and bound variables in '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$). Provided that '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ and Generation-Premise we define inductively:

cases	frV '$\mathfrak{e}$' =	bdV '$\mathfrak{e}$' =
$m = 0$	$\{\text{`op'}\} \cap \mathrm{VAR}$	$\varnothing$
$m > 0$	$\bigcup_{i:1..m} (\mathrm{frV}\,\text{`}\mathfrak{a}_i\text{'} \setminus \lfloor \vec{\nu_i} \rfloor)$	$\bigcup_{i:1..m} (\mathrm{bdV}\,\text{`}\mathfrak{a}_i\text{'} \cup \lfloor \vec{\nu_i} \rfloor)$

Remark: If 'op' $\in$ VAR then $\{\text{`op'}\} \cap \mathrm{VAR} = \{\text{`op'}\}$, otherwise $\{\text{`op'}\} \cap \mathrm{VAR} = \varnothing$.

5.3 Observation (1) '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{\mathfrak{u}}] \ \leftrightarrow$ '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma \ \wedge\ \mathrm{frV}$ '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\subseteq \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \rfloor$
(2) '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{\mathfrak{u}}] \ \rightarrow \ \left(\lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \rfloor \cap \mathcal{W} = \varnothing \ \rightarrow\ \mathrm{frV}\ \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'} \cap \mathcal{W} = \varnothing\right)$

5.4 Definition Substitutability: $\mathrm{Subb} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_S \times \mathrm{VAR} \times \mathfrak{L}_S$

Generation-Premise $\rightarrow$ Subb('$\mathfrak{d}$' , '$\mathfrak{x}$' , '$\mathfrak{e}$') $\leftrightarrow$

$\leftrightarrow$ $(\forall\, \mathfrak{i} : 1\,..\,\mathfrak{m})\,\Big(\,$'$\mathfrak{x}$' $\in \lfloor \vec{\nu_\mathfrak{i}} \rfloor \;\vee\; \big(\text{Subb}($ '$\mathfrak{d}$' , '$\mathfrak{x}$' , '$\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{i}$' $) \wedge \text{frV}$ '$\mathfrak{d}$' $\cap \lfloor \vec{\nu_\mathfrak{i}} \rfloor = \varnothing\big)\Big)$

5.5 Notation '$\mathfrak{e}[\mathfrak{x} \leftarrow \mathfrak{d}]$' $\overset{\text{alias}}{=}$ '$\mathfrak{e}^{\mathfrak{x}}_{\mathfrak{d}}$' denotes the result of replacing each *free occurring* '$\mathfrak{x}$' by '$\mathfrak{d}$' applied to '$\mathfrak{e}$'. This is a special case of next Definition (with $\mathfrak{l} = 1$).

5.6 Definition '$\mathfrak{e}[\vec{\mathfrak{x}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{d}}]$' $\overset{\text{alias}}{=}$ '$\mathfrak{e}^{\vec{\mathfrak{x}}}_{\vec{\mathfrak{d}}}$' (for '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$, $\vec{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_\mathfrak{i} \rangle_{\mathfrak{i}:1..\ell} \in \text{VSRT}^\ell$, $\vec{\mathfrak{x}} = \langle$ '$\mathfrak{x}_\mathfrak{i}$' $\rangle_{\mathfrak{i}:1..\ell} \in \text{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}}$, $\vec{\mathfrak{d}} = \langle$ '$\mathfrak{d}_\mathfrak{i}$' $\rangle_{\mathfrak{i}:1..\ell} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\sigma}}$) denotes the result of simultaneously replacing each *free occurring* '$\mathfrak{x}_\mathfrak{i}$' by '$\mathfrak{d}_\mathfrak{i}$' $(\mathfrak{i} : 1\,..\,\ell)$ applied to '$\mathfrak{e}$'. If a variable appears more than once within the sequence $\vec{\mathfrak{x}}$, the rightmost $\mathfrak{d}_\mathfrak{i}$ of the corresponding position replaces the variable. This is defined inductively: if Generation-Premise is supposed, then

cases		'$\mathfrak{e}[\vec{\mathfrak{x}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{d}}]$' =
$\mathfrak{m} = 0$	'op' $\in \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{x}} \rfloor$	= '$\mathfrak{d}_\mathfrak{k}$' with $\mathfrak{k} = \max_{\mathfrak{j}:1..\ell}($'$\text{op}$' = '$\mathfrak{x}_\mathfrak{j}$' $)$
	otherwise	= 'op' (= '$\mathfrak{e}$')
$\mathfrak{m} > 0$		= '$\text{op}(\ldots, [(\vec{\nu_\mathfrak{i}})\text{:}\ ]\ \underset{\text{if } \mathfrak{r}_\mathfrak{i} > 0}{}\ \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{i}[\vec{\mathfrak{x}}\vec{\nu_\mathfrak{i}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{d}}\vec{\nu_\mathfrak{i}}], \ldots)$'

Substitution $[\vec{\mathfrak{x}}\vec{\nu}_\mathfrak{i} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{d}}\vec{\nu}_\mathfrak{i}]$ differs from $[\vec{\mathfrak{x}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{d}}]$ exactly if the sequences $\vec{\mathfrak{x}}$ and $\vec{\nu}_\mathfrak{i}$ have common members. If '$\mathfrak{x}_\mathfrak{i}$' = '$\nu_{\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{j}}$' then the replacement of $\mathfrak{x}_\mathfrak{i}$ by $\mathfrak{d}_\mathfrak{i}$ is prohibited in the substitution $[\vec{\mathfrak{x}}\vec{\nu}_\mathfrak{i} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{d}}\vec{\nu}_\mathfrak{i}]$. This prevents replacing bound variables.

II. Notational Clause *Inside of* $[... \leftarrow ...]$ *an identifier* $\mathfrak{a}$ *for any expression* '$\mathfrak{a}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\alpha$ *denotes the sequence* $\langle$ '$\mathfrak{a}$' $\rangle$ *of length 1. E.g.* $\mathfrak{e}[\vec{\mathfrak{x}}\mathfrak{y}\vec{\mathfrak{z}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{a}}\mathfrak{b}\vec{\mathfrak{c}}]$ *is to be read as* $\mathfrak{e}[\vec{\mathfrak{x}}\langle$ '$\mathfrak{y}$' $\rangle\vec{\mathfrak{z}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{a}}\langle$ '$\mathfrak{b}$' $\rangle\vec{\mathfrak{c}}]$.

Laws of *substitution* enumerated within the subsequent five *lemmas* shall prove to be essential prerequisites for propositions concerning the *term structure* obtained from a consistent *theory* in our final section. The proofs of these (intuitively clear) *lemmas* 5.7 to 5.11 mainly rely on *syntactic induction* using Generation-Premise.

5.7 Lemma Let '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ $\vec{\rho}, \vec{\sigma} \in \text{VSRT}^*$ $\vec{\mathfrak{u}} \in \text{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}}$ $\vec{\mathfrak{c}} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\sigma}}$.
If frV '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\cap \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \rfloor = \varnothing$ then '$\mathfrak{e}[\vec{\mathfrak{u}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{c}}]$' = '$\mathfrak{e}$'. This is a special case of the next

5.8 Lemma Let '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ $\vec{\mathfrak{y}} \in \text{VAR}_{\vec{\eta}}$ $\vec{\mathfrak{u}} \in \text{VAR}_{\vec{\rho}}$ $\vec{\eta}, \vec{\rho} \in \text{VSRT}^*$ $\vec{\mathfrak{r}} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\rho}}$ $\vec{\mathfrak{s}} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\eta}}$.
If frV '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\cap \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{y}} \rfloor$ then '$\mathfrak{e}[\vec{\mathfrak{u}}\vec{\mathfrak{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{r}}\vec{\mathfrak{s}}]$' = '$\mathfrak{e}[\vec{\mathfrak{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{s}}]$'.

Proof. From the premises (i) frV '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\cap \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{y}} \rfloor$ (ii) Generation-Premise and (iii) *induction hypotheses* we shall infer the succedent *left* = *right*.

Case $\mathfrak{m} = 0$. Then '$\mathfrak{e}$' = 'op' and frV '$\mathfrak{e}$' = { '$\mathfrak{e}$' } $\cap$ VAR. By (i) and the fact, that $\lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \rfloor \subseteq$ VAR we obtain (iv) { '$\mathfrak{e}$' } $\cap \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{u}} \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor \vec{\mathfrak{y}} \rfloor$

Case 'e' $\in \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{u}}\vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor$. Then (iv) implies (v) 'e' $\in \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor$. According to 5.6 *def., case* 'op' $\in \lfloor ... \rfloor$, on the preceding page we have

(vi) *left* = '$\mathsf{e}[\vec{\mathsf{u}}\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}}]$' $= \mathtt{pj}_{\mathsf{k}}(\vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}})$, where k is the maximal within range $1 \ldots \ell_{\vec{\rho}\vec{\eta}}$, so that $\mathtt{pj}_{\mathsf{k}}(\vec{\mathsf{u}}\vec{\mathsf{y}}) =$ 'e'. (v) implies that

(vii) $\mathsf{k} = \ell_{\vec{\rho}} + \mathsf{j}$, where j is the maximal within range $1 \ldots \ell_{\vec{\eta}}$ so that $\mathtt{pj}_{\mathsf{j}}(\vec{\mathsf{y}}) =$ 'y_{j}' = 'e'.

(vi)+(vii) yield *left* $= \mathtt{pj}_{\ell_{\vec{\rho}}+\mathsf{j}}(\vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}})$ = 's_{j}' and *right* = '$\mathsf{e}[\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{s}}]$' = '$\mathsf{s}_{\mathsf{j}}$'; *left* = *right*.

Case 'e' $\notin \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{u}}\vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor$. According to 5.6 *def., case* 'op' $\notin \lfloor ... \rfloor$, on the page before *left* = *right*.

Case $\mathsf{m} \neq 0$.

(iv) $(\mathrm{frV}\,\text{'}\mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{i}}\text{'} \smallsetminus \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \rfloor) \cap \vec{\mathsf{u}} \subseteq \vec{\mathsf{y}}$ from (i), 5.2 *def.of* frV on page 10

(v) $\mathrm{frV}\,\text{'}\mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{i}}\text{'} \cap \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{u}} \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor \cup \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \rfloor = \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \rfloor$ as $\mathsf{A} \subseteq \mathsf{B}$ implies $\mathsf{A} \cup \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \rfloor \subseteq \mathsf{B} \cup \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \rfloor$

(vi) *left* = '$\mathsf{e}[\vec{\mathsf{u}}\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}}]$' $\underset{5.6}{=}$ '$\mathrm{op}(___\underset{\text{if } \mathsf{r}_{\mathsf{i}}>0}{[(\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}})\colon]}\ \mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{i}}[\vec{\mathsf{u}}\vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}}]___)$'
$\underset{(\mathrm{iii})+(\mathrm{v})}{=}$ '$\mathrm{op}(___\underset{\text{if } \mathsf{r}_{\mathsf{i}}>0}{[(\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}})\colon]}\ \mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{i}}[\vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{s}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}}]___)$'
$\underset{5.6}{=}$ '$\mathsf{e}[\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{s}}]$' = *right*

□

5.9 Lemma Let 'e' $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\gamma}$ $\vec{\mathsf{x}} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\xi}}$ $\vec{\mathsf{y}} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\eta}}$ $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\eta} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^*$ $\vec{\mathsf{r}} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\xi}}$ $\vec{\mathsf{s}} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\eta}}$
If $\bigcup_{\mathsf{j}:1..\ell_{\vec{\mathsf{r}}}} \mathrm{frV}\,\text{'}\mathsf{r}_{\mathsf{j}}\text{'} \cap (\lfloor \vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor \cup \mathrm{bdV}\,\text{'}\mathsf{e}\text{'}) = \varnothing$ then '$\mathsf{e}[\vec{\mathsf{x}}\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}}]$' = '$\mathsf{e}[\vec{\mathsf{x}}\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{y}}][\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{s}}]$'.

Remark If $\vec{\mathsf{r}} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\xi}}[]$, then the last condition is true.

Proof. From the premises (i,ii,iii) we shall infer *left* = *right* (succedent of the lemma).
(i) *premises of lemma*; (ii) Generation-Premise; (iii) *induction hypothesis*

Case $\mathsf{m} = 0$. Then 'e' = 'op'

Case 'e' $\notin \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{x}}\vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor$. Then *left* = '$\mathsf{e}$' = *right* (according to 5.6 *def.* on the page before)

Case 'e' $\in \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{x}} \rfloor \smallsetminus \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor$. Then *left* = '$\mathsf{r}_{\mathsf{m}}$', where m is the maximal $\mathsf{m} \leq \ell_{\xi}$ so that 'e' = 'x_{m}'. Hence *right* = '$\mathsf{r}_{\mathsf{m}}[\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{s}}]$'. (i) and 5.7 yield *right* = 'r_{m}'; *left* = *right*

Case 'e' $\in \lfloor \vec{\mathsf{y}} \rfloor$. Then *left* = '$\mathsf{s}_{\mathsf{m}}$' where m is the maximal so that 'e' = 'y_{m}', hence *right* = '$\mathsf{y}_{\mathsf{m}}[\vec{\mathsf{y}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{s}}]$' = '$\mathsf{s}_{\mathsf{m}}$', *left* =*right*.

Case $\mathsf{m} > 0$. Now the premises (ii),(iii) become relevant. Again we infer *left* =*right*.

(iv) *left* = '$\mathrm{op}(___\underset{\text{if } \mathsf{r}_{\mathsf{i}}>0}{[(\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}})\colon]}\ \mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{i}}[\vec{\mathsf{x}}\vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}}]___)$'
As $\lfloor \vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \rfloor \subseteq \mathrm{bdV}\,\text{'}\mathsf{e}\text{'}$ (i) implies $\bigcup_{\mathsf{j}:1..\ell_{\vec{\mathsf{r}}}} \mathrm{frV}\,\text{'}\mathsf{r}_{\mathsf{j}}\text{'} \cap (\lfloor \vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \rfloor \cup \mathrm{bdV}\mathsf{e}) = \varnothing$, then (iii) yields

(v) '$\mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{i}}[\vec{\mathsf{x}}\vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{s}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}}]$' = '$\mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{i}}[\vec{\mathsf{x}}\vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{r}}\vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}}][\vec{\mathsf{y}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathsf{s}}\vec{\mathsf{v}_{\mathsf{i}}}]$'
Substituting in (iv) and application of 5.6 yield

(vi) *left*= ‘op(___$\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{v_i}):]}\ a_i[\vec{x}\vec{y}\vec{v_i} \leftarrow \vec{r}\vec{y}\vec{v_i}]$___)$[\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{s}]$’

$\underset{5.6}{=}$ ‘$e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{r}\vec{y}][\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{s}]$’ = *right*

□

5.10 Lemma Let ‘e’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ $x \in \mathrm{VAR}_\rho$ $\vec{y} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\eta}}$ $\rho, \vec{\eta} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^*$ ‘r’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_\rho$.

$$\text{‘}e[x\vec{y} \leftarrow r\vec{y}]\text{’} = \begin{cases} \text{‘}e\text{’} & \text{if ‘}x\text{’} \in \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor \\ \text{‘}e[x \leftarrow r]\text{’} & \text{if ‘}x\text{’} \notin \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor \end{cases}$$

Proof. Again rely on Generation-Premise and use induction, the result then comes immediately from 5.6 *def.* □

For the purpose of proving the next lemma we observe

Sublemma 1 Let ‘e’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ $\vec{x} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\xi}}$ $\vec{y} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\eta}}$ $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\eta} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^*$ $\vec{r} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\xi}}$.
If $\lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor \cap \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor = \varnothing$ then ‘$e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{r}\vec{y}]$’ = ‘$e[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{r}]$’

5.11 Lemma Let ‘e’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ $\vec{x} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\xi}}$ $\vec{y} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\eta}}$ $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\eta} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^*$ $\vec{c} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\xi}}[]$ $\vec{d} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\eta}}[]$.
If $\lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor \cap \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor = \varnothing$ then ‘$e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{d}]$’ = ‘$e[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}][\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$’ = ‘$e[\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{d}][\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}]$’.

Proof. Proving the *sublemma* is as easy as for the previous lemma. For the current *lemma* two equations are considered. From 5.9+*remark* and the preceding *sublemma* we immediately obtain the first (‘$e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{d}]$’ = ‘$e[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}][\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$’). in order to enable the induction step for the second equation we prove more generally for arbitrary $\vec{u} \in \mathrm{VAR}^*$

(*) ‘$e[\vec{x}\vec{y}\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{d}\vec{u}]$’ = ‘$e[\vec{y}\vec{x}\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{d}\vec{c}\vec{u}]$’

Assume *premises of the lemma*, Generation-Premise and *induction hypothesis*.

Case $m = 0$. Then ‘e’ = ‘op’

- *Case* ‘e’ $\notin \lfloor \vec{x}\vec{y}\vec{u} \rfloor$. Then *left* = ‘$e$’ = *right* (according to 5.6 *def.* on page 11, 2nd line of the table)
- *Case* ‘e’ $\in \lfloor \vec{u} \rfloor$. Then ‘$e$’ = ‘$u_p$’. From 5.6 *def.* (1st line of the table) and the observation, that the rightmost occurrence of ‘e’ within $\vec{x}\vec{y}\vec{u}$ belongs to $\vec{u}$ we infer *left* = $\mathtt{pj}_{\ell_x+\ell_y+p}(\vec{x}\vec{y}\vec{u})$ = ‘u_p’ = ‘e’. and by obvious symmetric consideration *right* = ‘e’.
- *Case* ‘e’ $\in \lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor \smallsetminus \lfloor \vec{u} \rfloor$. Then, as $\lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor \cap \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor = \varnothing$ is assumed, ‘e’ $\notin \lfloor \vec{y}\vec{u} \rfloor$ and 5.6 *def.*, 1st line of table yields *left* = ‘c_m’, where m is the maximal $m \le \ell_\xi$ so that ‘e’ = ‘x_m’. Then $\ell_{\vec{y}} + m$ is the corresponding position for *right*, i.e. *right* = $\mathtt{pj}_{\ell_{\vec{y}}+m}(\vec{d}\vec{c}\vec{u}) = \mathtt{pj}_m(\vec{c})$ = ‘c_m’; *left* =*right*.
- *Case* ‘e’ $\in \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor \smallsetminus \lfloor \vec{u} \rfloor$ is obviously similar to the preceding case (exchange x with y as well as *left* with *right*)

Case $\mathfrak{m} > 0$. From Generation-Premise and 5.6 *def.*, 3rd line of table we obtain

left= '$\mathrm{op}(__\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{\nu_i}):]}\ \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{y}\vec{u}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{d}\vec{u}\vec{\nu_i}]__)$'

right= '$\mathrm{op}(__\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{\nu_i}):]}\ \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{y}\vec{x}\vec{u}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{d}\vec{c}\vec{u}\vec{\nu_i}]__)$'

Replacing the argument-expressions according to the *induction hypothesis* ('$\mathfrak{a}_i$' in place of '$\mathfrak{e}$' and $\vec{u}\vec{\nu_i}$ in place of $\vec{u}$) yields *left* =*right*. □

III. Notational Clauses (1) We write '$\forall x$' for '$\forall^{\xi} x$' if 'x' $\in \mathrm{VAR}_\xi$, and (2) '$\forall \vec{z}$' for '$\forall z_1 \ldots \forall z_\ell$' if $\vec{z} = \langle$'z_i'$\rangle_{i:1..\ell}$. This includes *case* $\ell = 0$, as for $\vec{u} = \langle\rangle$ '$\forall \vec{u}\, \varphi$' = '$\varphi$' is stipulated. (3) '$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$' is an alias for '$\mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{b}$' if $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$.

5.12 Calculus of Functional Logic $\mathsf{Fnl} = \mathsf{Fnl}_S$ is defined for Fnl^1 Signat S as a triple of the component sets *formulae, axioms* and *rules* specified as follows:

Formulae $\mathfrak{L}_\pi$ (s. 3.2 on page 6). ***Axioms*** *Propositional Tautologies* ;
Predicate Logic Axioms Like in 1^{st} *order predicate logic* but related to the extended notions of *free vars., bound vars., substitutability* and *substitution.* The Axioms are '$\forall x\ \varphi \to \varphi^x_{\mathfrak{a}}$' , '$\varphi^x_{\mathfrak{a}} \to \exists x\ \varphi$' (*meta condition* Subb('$\mathfrak{a}$', 'x', 'φ') provided)
'$\forall x (\psi \to \varphi) \to (\psi \to \forall x\ \varphi)$', '$\forall x (\varphi \to \psi) \to (\exists x\ \varphi \to \psi)$' (if '$x$' $\notin \mathrm{frV}$'ψ').
Equality Axioms
(I1) '$\mathfrak{a} \overset{\alpha}{=} \mathfrak{a}$' (for $\alpha \in \mathrm{SRT}$, '$\mathfrak{a}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\alpha$)
(I2) '$\forall \vec{z}\ \ \mathfrak{b}_1[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{z}] \overset{\alpha_i}{=} \mathfrak{b}_2[\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{z}] \ \to\ \mathrm{op}\big(\Delta, \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{x}):]}\ \mathfrak{b}_1, \Gamma\big) \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathrm{op}\big(\Delta, \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{y}):]}\ \mathfrak{b}_2, \Gamma\big)$'

where 'op' $\in \mathrm{SOP}$, sign'op' $= \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \overset{\Rightarrow}{\beta} \rangle$ $\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{z} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\beta_i}}$ $\mathfrak{b}_1, \mathfrak{b}_2 \in \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}$
$\lfloor \vec{z} \rfloor \cap (\mathrm{frV}$'$\mathfrak{b}_1$'$\cup \mathrm{frV}$'$\mathfrak{b}_2$'$) = \varnothing$ and Δ and Γ may be further arguments or empty.

Rules *Detachment* 'φ' , '$(\varphi \to \psi)$' $\mapsto$ 'ψ' and *Generalization* : 'φ' $\mapsto$ '$\forall x\ \varphi$'
('φ', 'ψ' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\pi$, 'x' $\in \mathrm{VAR}$)

Remark: For $\alpha \in \mathrm{VSRT}$ scheme (I1) could be replaced by a single axiom '$x \overset{\alpha}{=} x$' (for one fixed 'x' $\in \mathrm{VAR}_\alpha$).

5.13 Notation 'φ_1', ..., 'φ_m' $\underset{S}{\vdash}$ 'ψ' ($\mathfrak{m} \geq 0$) is used for "ψ can be *inferred or deduced* within the *calculus* Fnl_S augmented by *premises or additional axioms* $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_m$ if $\mathfrak{m} > 0$". We shall write only $\vdash$ for $\underset{S}{\vdash}$ if reference to S is clear.

5.14 Laws of equality (Let $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$)

(I3) $\vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b} \ \to\ \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a}$' (symmetry of equality)

(I4) $\vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b} \ \to\ \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c} \ \to\ \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{c}$' (transitivity of equality)

Proof. (I3) $\Leftarrow$ $\mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{b} \to (\mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a}) \overset{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{=} (\mathfrak{b} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a})$ is an inst. of (I2),
$\to\ \mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a} \ \to\ \mathfrak{b} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a}$ as '$\overset{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{=}$' coincides with '$\leftrightarrow$'
interchanging the premises by virtue of a *propositional tautology* and detaching $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$ yields (I3)

(I4) $\Leftarrow$ $\mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{b} \to (\mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{c}) \overset{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{=} (\mathfrak{b} \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{c})$ is an instance of (I2)
$\to\ \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c} \ \to\ \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{c}$ as '$\overset{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{=}$' coincides with '$\leftrightarrow$' □

5.15 Equality Theorem Let 'e' $\in \mathfrak{L}$ 'r', 's' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\tau$ $\vec{y} \in \text{VAR}^*$ and 'z' $\in \text{VAR}_\tau$.
(I5) If bdV 'e' $\cap$ frV '$r = s$' $\subseteq \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor$ then $\vdash$ '$\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s) \rightarrow e[z \leftarrow r] = e[z \leftarrow s]$'

Proof. Assume (1) the premises of the theorem, (2) Generation-Premise, (3) induction premise, then we observe 'e' = '$\text{op}(\ldots, [(\vec{v_i})\colon]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ a_i, \ldots)$' and infer the succeeding

(4) $\text{bdV}\,'e' = \bigcup_{i:1..m} (\text{bdV}\,'a_i' \cup \lfloor \vec{v_i} \rfloor)$ by 5.2 *def* on page 10;

therefore $\text{bdV}\,'a_i' \subseteq \text{bdV}\,'e'$, from (1) we obtain

(5) $\text{bdV}\,'a_i' \cap \text{frV}\,'r = s' \subseteq \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor$;

(6) '$e[z \leftarrow t]$' = '$\text{op}(\ldots, [(\vec{v_i})\colon]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ a_i[\vec{z}\vec{v_i} \leftarrow \vec{t}\vec{v_i}], \ldots)$' by 5.6 *def.* on page 11
(with 't' intended to be replaced both by 'r' and 's')

case 'z' $\in \lfloor \vec{v_i} \rfloor$: '$a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow t, \vec{v_i}]$'= '$a_i$' by 5.10 *lemma* on page 13
'$a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow r, \vec{v_i}]$'= '$a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow s, \vec{v_i}]$' hence
$\vdash$ '$a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow r, \vec{v_i}] = a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow s, \vec{v_i}]$' (instance of (I1))

case 'z' $\notin \lfloor \vec{v_i} \rfloor$: '$a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow t, \vec{v_i}]$' = '$a_i[z \leftarrow t]$' from 5.10 *lemma* on page 13
$\vdash$ '$\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s) \rightarrow a_i[z \leftarrow r] = a_i[z \leftarrow s]$' by (3)
$\lfloor \vec{v_i} \rfloor \cap \text{frV}\,'r = s' \subseteq \lfloor \vec{y} \rfloor$, $\lfloor \vec{v_i} \rfloor \cap \text{frV}\,'\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s)' = \varnothing$ from (1)+(4)
$\vdash$ '$\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s) \rightarrow \forall \vec{v_i}\,(a_i[z \leftarrow r] = a_i[z \leftarrow s])$' from the preceding 2 lines

Both cases yield $\vdash$ '$\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s) \rightarrow \forall \vec{v_i}\,(a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow r, \vec{v_i}] = a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow s, \vec{v_i}])$'.

Let 'P_i' = '$[(\vec{v_i})\colon]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ p_i$' '$p_i$' = '$a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow r, \vec{v_i}]$' '$Q_i$' = '$[(\vec{v_i})\colon]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ q_i$' '$q_i$' = '$a_i[z, \vec{v_i} \leftarrow s, \vec{v_i}]$'
Then $\vdash$ '$\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s) \rightarrow \forall \vec{v_i}(p_i = q_i)$'
$\vdash$ '$\forall \vec{v_i}(p_i = q_i) \rightarrow \text{op}(P_1, .., P_{i-1}, P_i, Q_{i+1}, ...) = \text{op}(P_1, .., P_{i-1}, Q_i, Q_{i+1}, ...)$'

By chaining these implications and using (I4) on p. on the preceding page we obtain

$$\vdash \text{'}\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s) \rightarrow \text{op}(P_1, \ldots, P_m) = \text{op}(Q_1, \ldots, Q_m)\text{'}$$

note that '$\text{op}(\ldots, P_i, \ldots)$' = '$e[z \leftarrow r]$' and '$\text{op}(\ldots, Q_i, \ldots)$' = '$e[z \leftarrow s]$', hence $\vdash$ '$\forall \vec{y}\,(r = s) \rightarrow e[z \leftarrow r] = e[z \leftarrow s]$'. This concludes the induction step. □

5.16 Corollary (Equality Rule) '$r = s$' $\vdash$ '$e[z \leftarrow r] = e[z \leftarrow s]$'

6 Formalized Theories

Throughout the paragraph we assume $S \in \text{Fnl}^1\ \text{Signat}$.

6.1 Definition A functional logic theory is an extension of the *calculus* Fnl_S by adding a set $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^\pi_S$ to the axioms. The resulting *system* is symbolized by $\text{Fnl}_S[\mathcal{T}]$. Members of $\mathcal{T}$ are called *nonlogical axioms* of the system. (We shall often refer to $\text{Fnl}_S[\mathcal{T}]$ when using $\mathcal{T}$)

6.2 Notation $\mathcal{T} \vdash_{\mathsf{S}}$ 'φ' iff there is a *proof* of 'φ' within the *formal system* $\mathsf{Fml}_{\mathsf{S}}[\mathcal{T}]$. (alias φ is a *theorem of* $\mathcal{T}$, or can be *inferred from* $\mathcal{T}$) We shall omit S and write $\mathcal{T} \vdash$ 'φ' instead if only one S is considered. In the sequel we shall always assume $\mathsf{Fml}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ \mathsf{S}$.

6.3 Definition $\mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \wedge \mathcal{T} \nvdash$ '$\lightning$'

6.4 Compactness Theorem Each *theorem* of $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\pi}$ is inferable from a *finite subset* of $\mathcal{T}$, that is $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\pi} \rightarrow \mathcal{T} \vdash$ 'φ' $\leftrightarrow \exists \Delta \left(\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{T} \wedge \mathrm{finite}(\Delta) \wedge \Delta \vdash \text{'}\varphi\text{'}\right)$

Proof. A (formal) proof only comprises a finite number of axioms, hence only a finite subset of $\mathcal{T}$. □

6.5 Definition $\mathcal{T}$ is called *complete relative to* S, if $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\mathsf{S}}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ and each closed formula of S is decidable in $\mathcal{T}$, that is

$$\mathsf{Complete}_{\mathsf{S}}(\mathcal{T}) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\mathsf{S}}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \wedge (\forall \text{'}\varphi\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\mathsf{S}}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[]\,)\,(\ \mathcal{T} \vdash_{\mathsf{S}} \text{'}\varphi\text{'} \vee \mathcal{T} \vdash_{\mathsf{S}} \text{'}\neg\varphi\text{'}\ )$$

(Dependency from S is significant, but we shall omit S if confusion is impossible)

6.6 Definition $\mathsf{S}_1 \sqsubseteq \mathsf{S}_2$ symbolizes (for $\mathsf{Fml}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ \mathsf{S}_1, \mathsf{S}_2$): "$\mathsf{S}_2$ is an extension of S_1", i.e. all components of S_1 and S_2 but SOP and sign agree, $\mathrm{SOP}_{\mathsf{S}_1} \subseteq \mathrm{SOP}_{\mathsf{S}_2}$ and $\mathrm{sign}_{\mathsf{S}_1} = \mathrm{SOP}_{\mathsf{S}_1} \restriction \mathrm{sign}_{\mathsf{S}_2}$.

6.7 Deduction Theorem (a special form)
$\Gamma \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \wedge \text{'}\varphi\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[] \wedge \text{'}\psi\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \rightarrow \left(\Gamma \cup \{\text{'}\varphi\text{'}\} \vdash \text{'}\psi\text{'} \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{'}\varphi \rightarrow \psi\text{'}\right)$

Proof. see [SHO67], p.33 □

6.8 Theorem of Lindenbaum *For a consistent theory a consistent complete simple extension exists.*

$$\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\mathsf{S}}^{\pi} \wedge \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \exists \mathcal{T}_2\,(\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_2 \wedge \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_2) \wedge \mathsf{Complete}_{\mathsf{S}}(\mathcal{T}_2))$$

Proof. By 3.1 Def. of $\mathsf{Fml}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}$ $\mathrm{SOP}_{\mathsf{S}} \cup \mathrm{VAR}_{\mathsf{S}}$ can be well-ordered. This implicitly applies to the sets of expressions $\mathfrak{L}_{\gamma}$ and $\mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[]$ (= set of closed formulae), too. Hence we may suppose an *ordinal enumeration* $\langle \text{'}\varphi_{\alpha}\text{'} \rangle_{\alpha \in \kappa}$ of $\mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[]$, that is

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[] = \{\text{'}\varphi_{\alpha}\text{'} \mid \alpha < \kappa\} \tag{1}$$

We claim the following *Lemma:*

$$\forall \mathcal{T}\, \forall \text{'}\psi\text{'}\ (\ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \wedge \text{'}\psi\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[] \wedge \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \rightarrow \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\text{'}\psi\text{'}\}) \vee \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\text{'}\neg\psi\text{'}\})\ ) \tag{2}$$

For if the opposite is assumed, then $\neg\, \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\text{'}\psi\text{'}\})$ and $\neg\, \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\text{'}\neg\psi\text{'}\})$. By 6.3 then $\mathcal{T} \cup \{\text{'}\psi\text{'}\} \vdash$ '$\lightning$' and $\mathcal{T} \cup \{\text{'}\neg\psi\text{'}\} \vdash$ '$\lightning$'. By

6.4 (compactness theorem) and the premise $\mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T})$ we conclude that there are $\text{‘}\chi_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\chi_k\text{’},\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_\ell\text{’}$ so that $\{\text{‘}\chi_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\chi_k\text{’},\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_\ell\text{’}\}\subseteq\mathcal{T}$, $\{\text{‘}\chi_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\chi_k\text{’},\text{‘}\psi\text{’}\}\vdash\text{‘}\curlywedge\text{’}$ and $\{\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_\ell\text{’},\text{‘}\neg\psi\text{’}\}\vdash\text{‘}\curlywedge\text{’}$. With 6.7 (deduction theorem) we obtain $\{\text{‘}\chi_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\chi_k\text{’}\}\vdash\text{‘}\psi\ \to\ \curlywedge\text{’}$ and $\{\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_\ell\text{’}\}\vdash\text{‘}\neg\psi\ \to\ \curlywedge\text{’}$; thus $\{\text{‘}\chi_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\chi_k\text{’},\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_\ell\text{’}\}\vdash\text{‘}\curlywedge\text{’}$, that is $\neg\,\mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T})$ in contradiction to the above premise. This confirms (2) *Lemma*. Using (1) we inductively define an ordinal sequence $\langle\mathcal{T}_\alpha\rangle_{\alpha\in\kappa+1}$:

(3.1) $\mathcal{T}_0=\mathrm{EAx}_\mathsf{T}$ (3.2) $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha+1}=\begin{cases}\mathcal{T}_\alpha\cup\{\text{‘}\varphi_\alpha\text{’}\} & \text{if } \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha\cup\{\text{‘}\varphi_\alpha\text{’}\})\\ \mathcal{T}_\alpha\cup\{\text{‘}\neg\varphi_\alpha\text{’}\} & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}$

(3.3) $\mathcal{T}_\lambda=\bigcup\limits_{\xi\in\lambda}\mathcal{T}_\xi$ for a limit ordinal $\lambda\in(\kappa+1)$

we observe

(4.1) $\mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_0)$ (4.2) $\alpha\in\kappa\ \to\ \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha)\ \to\ \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha+1})$

(4.3) limit ordinal $\lambda\in(\kappa+1)\ \wedge\ (\forall\,\alpha\in\lambda)\ \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha)\ \to\ \mathsf{Consistent}(\bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\lambda}\mathcal{T}_\alpha)$

Subproof. If $\neg\,\mathsf{Consistent}(\bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\lambda}\mathcal{T}_\alpha)$, then by 6.4 (compactness theorem) there are $\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_k\text{’}$ so that (∗) $\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_k\text{’}\in\bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in\lambda}\mathcal{T}_\alpha\ \wedge\ \{\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_k\text{’}\}\vdash\text{‘}\curlywedge\text{’}$. Thus, there are $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_k<\lambda$, so that $(\forall\,i:1..k)\ \theta_i\in\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_i}$. Let $\beta=\bigcup\limits_{i:1..k}\alpha_i$ then also $\beta<\lambda$ and $\{\text{‘}\theta_1\text{’},\ldots,\text{‘}\theta_k\text{’}\}\subseteq\mathcal{T}_\beta$, due to (*) then $\neg\,\mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_\beta)$ contradicting the antecedent of implication (4.3). This confirms (4.3). By *ordinal induction* (limited to range $\kappa+1$) we obtain (5); By (1) using 6.5 *proposition* we infer (6) (Subproof below).

(5) $\mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T}_\kappa)$ (6) $\mathsf{Complete}(\mathcal{T}_\kappa)$

Subproof. According to (1) for an arbitrary formula $\text{‘}\psi\text{’}\in\mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[]$ $\alpha<\kappa$ exists so that $\text{‘}\psi\text{’}=\text{‘}\varphi_\alpha\text{’}$. (3.2) yields $\text{‘}\psi\text{’}\in\mathcal{T}_{\alpha+1}\ \vee\ \text{‘}\neg\psi\text{’}\in\mathcal{T}_{\alpha+1}$. From $\alpha+1\le\kappa$ by (3.1-3.3) obviously $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha+1}\subseteq\mathcal{T}_\kappa$, hence $\text{‘}\psi\text{’}\in\mathcal{T}_\kappa\ \vee\ \text{‘}\neg\psi\text{’}\in\mathcal{T}_\kappa$. $\text{‘}\psi\text{’}\in\mathcal{T}_\kappa$ implies $\mathcal{T}_\kappa\vdash\text{‘}\psi\text{’}$, hence $\mathcal{T}_\kappa\vdash\text{‘}\psi\text{’}\ \vee\ \mathcal{T}_\kappa\vdash\text{‘}\neg\psi\text{’}$. This confirms (6) □

6.9 Theorem (Henkin) For a theory $\mathcal{T}$ a *conservative extension* $\mathcal{T}'$ and a mapping

$$\text{‘}\varphi\text{’}\mapsto\text{‘}c_\varphi\text{’}:\ \bigcup_{\text{‘}x\text{’}\in\mathrm{VAR}}\mathfrak{L}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{S'}[\text{‘}x\text{’}]\to\mathrm{COP}_{S'}\quad\text{exists}\qquad(\text{note that }\ \mathrm{COP}_\xi\subseteq\mathfrak{L}_\xi[]),$$

so that for each $\text{‘}x\text{’}\in\mathrm{VAR}$ and $\text{‘}\varphi\text{’}\in\mathfrak{L}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{S'}[\text{‘}x\text{’}]$: $\text{‘}(\exists x\ \varphi\ \to\ \varphi[x\leftarrow c_\varphi])\text{’}\in\mathcal{T}'$ and $\mathrm{sign}\,\text{‘}c_\varphi\text{’}=\mathrm{sign}\,\text{‘}x\text{’}$. *Conservative extension* means

$$S\sqsubseteq S'\quad\mathcal{T}\subseteq\mathfrak{L}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_S\quad\mathcal{T}'\subseteq\mathfrak{L}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{S'}\quad\mathcal{T}\subseteq\mathcal{T}'\quad\text{and}\quad(\forall\,\text{‘}\psi\text{’}\in\mathfrak{L}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_S)\,\big(\mathcal{T}'\mid\!\!\!

Claim. $\mathcal{T}'$ is a *conservative extension* of $\mathcal{T}$: Assume (1) $\mathcal{T}' \underset{S'}{\vdash}$ 'φ' and (2) 'φ' $\in \mathfrak{L}^{\pi}_{S}$. Using 6.4 *compactness thm.* on page 16 and 6.7 *deduction thm.* on page 16, as $\mathcal{T}' \setminus \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^{\pi}_{S'}[]$, we conclude that there are 'ψ_1', ... 'ψ_m' $\in \mathcal{T}' \setminus \mathcal{T}$ so that

(3) $\quad \mathcal{T} \vdash$ '$\psi_1 \to \ldots \to \psi_m \to \varphi$' and '$\psi_1$' = '$\exists x\, \theta \to \theta[x \leftarrow c_\theta]$'

By appropriate arrangement we may assume that c_θ does not appear in any other ψ_j $(j = 2, .., m)$, hence we may replace c_θ by a new variable y so that

(4) $\quad \mathcal{T} \vdash$ '$(\exists x\, \theta \to \theta^x_y) \to \psi_2 \to \ldots \to \psi_m \to \varphi$'

applying well known logical rules and theorems we infer

$$\mathcal{T} \vdash \text{'}\exists y\, (\exists x\, \theta \to \theta^x_y) \to \psi_2 \to \ldots \to \psi_m \to \varphi\text{'}$$

The antecedent $\exists y\, (\exists x\, \theta \to \theta^x_y)$ is a logical theorem (deducible from the *variant theorem* '$\exists x\, \theta \to \exists y\, \theta^x_y$'), hence we can detach it and obtain
$\mathcal{T} \vdash$ '$\psi_2 \to \ldots \to \psi_m \to \varphi$'. Iterated application finally yields $\mathcal{T} \vdash$ 'φ' $\quad \square$

6.10 Definition For $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Structure}_S\, \mathfrak{M}$, $\varphi \in \mathfrak{L}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_\pi$ we define:

(1) $\quad \mathfrak{M} \underset{S}{\models}$ 'φ' $\quad \leftrightarrow \quad (\forall \vec{\sigma} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^*)\, (\forall \vec{u} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}})$
$\qquad\qquad \vec{u} \in \mathrm{persp}$'$\varphi$' $\to\ (\forall \vec{x} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\vec{\sigma}})\, \mathfrak{M}$'$\varphi$'$(\vec{u})(\vec{x}) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$

(2) $\quad \mathfrak{M} \underset{S}{\models} \mathcal{T} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad (\forall$'$\varphi$'$\in \mathcal{T})\ \mathfrak{M} \underset{S}{\models}$ 'φ'

(3) $\quad \mathcal{T} \underset{S}{\models}$ 'φ' $\quad \leftrightarrow \quad \forall \mathfrak{M}\, (\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Structure}_S\, \mathfrak{M} \wedge \mathfrak{M} \underset{S}{\models} \mathcal{T} \to \mathfrak{M} \underset{S}{\models}$ 'φ'$)$

For (1) we say $\mathfrak{M}$ is a *model* of (or $\mathfrak{M}$ *satisfies*) 'φ', this also applies to (2) w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. We write $\models$ for $\underset{S}{\models}$ as long as only one S is considered.

6.11 Observation If the premises of 4.8 on page 10 apply to $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{N}$ then $\mathfrak{M} \underset{S}{\models}$ and $\mathfrak{N} \underset{S}{\models}$ are interchangeable. This applies to $\mathfrak{N} = \overline{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}}$ of 4.9 as well.

Semantics can be reduced to a notion of *full structure* as $\overline{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}}$, characterized by $\overline{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\gamma} = \overline{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}}^{\overline{\mathfrak{M}}_{\vec{\sigma}}}_{\gamma}$ in place of conditions 4.1(3) on p. 7.

7 Obtaining a Model of a Consistent Theory

7.1 Extension Theorem Assume $\mathcal{T}$ is a consistent theory of signature S (technically $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ S \wedge \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^{\pi}_{S} \wedge \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T})$), then a so called *complete and consistent Henkin theory* $\mathcal{T}'$ exists, which is an extension of $\mathcal{T}$. That is, in the sequel we shall rely on the following conditions:

(1) $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}'$, $\quad \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^{\pi}_{S} \subset \mathfrak{L}^{\pi}_{S'} \supseteq \mathcal{T}'$ (2) $S \sqsubseteq S'$, the components $\mathrm{SRT}_{S'}, \mathrm{VSRT}_{S'}, \mathrm{SRT}_{S'}$ of signature S' agree with those of S, only SOP and COP differ. (In the sequel we shall omit the subscripts for those components that agree) (3) $\mathsf{Complete}_{S'}(\mathcal{T}')$.
(4) There is a map 'φ' $\mapsto$ '$\mathfrak{c}_{\varphi}$' : $\bigcup_{\text{'x'} \in \mathrm{VAR}} \mathfrak{L}^{\pi}_{S'}[\text{'x'}] \to \mathrm{COP}_{S'}$ that assigns to each 'φ' $\in \mathfrak{L}^{\pi}_{S'}[\text{'}\mathfrak{u}\text{'}]$ (formula with at least one free variable '$\mathfrak{u}$') the so called *special constant* '$\mathfrak{c}_{\varphi}$' so that $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\exists^{\alpha}\, \mathfrak{u}\, \varphi \;\to\; \varphi[\mathfrak{u} \leftarrow \mathfrak{c}_{\varphi}]$' and $\underline{\mathrm{sign}}_{S'}\text{'}\mathfrak{u}\text{'} = \underline{\mathrm{sign}}_{S'}\text{'}\mathfrak{c}_{\varphi}\text{'} = \text{'}\alpha\text{'}$

Proof. Use 6.9 on page 17, then for the resulting $\mathcal{T}'$ apply 6.8. The second extension does not cancel the qualities achieved with the first. □

Now we consider three consequences of 7.1 that shall be prerequisites for investigations related to a term-structure built upon S' and $\mathcal{T}'$.

7.2 Lemma If $\mathcal{T}'$ is a *Henkin theory* due to 7.1(4), $\varphi \in \mathfrak{L}_{\pi}[\vec{z}]$, $\vec{z} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\rho}}$, $\vec{\rho} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^{r}$ and all components of $\vec{z}$ are different then there are special constants '$\mathfrak{c}_i$' $\in \mathrm{COP}_{\rho_i}$ $(i : 1\,..\,r)$ so that for $\vec{\mathfrak{c}} = \langle \mathfrak{c}_i \rangle_{i:1..r}$: $\quad \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\varphi[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{c}}] \;\to\; \forall \vec{z}\, \varphi$'

Proof. For 'φ' $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\pi}[\text{'x'}]$, '$\mathfrak{d}$' = '$\mathfrak{c}_{\neg\varphi}$' by 7.1(4) $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\varphi[x \leftarrow \mathfrak{d}] \to \forall x\, \varphi$'. Instances of such theorems are '$(\psi_0 \to \psi_1)$', ..., '$(\psi_{r-1} \to \psi_r)$', where each 'ψ_i' = '$\forall z_1 \,...\, \forall z_i\, (\varphi[z_{i+1} \leftarrow \mathfrak{c}_{i+1}]...[z_r \leftarrow \mathfrak{c}_r])$'. Transitivity of *implication* yields
$\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\psi_0 \to \psi_r$', according to *lemma* 5.11 on page 13 'ψ_0' = '$\varphi[z_1 \leftarrow \mathfrak{c}_1]...[z_r \leftarrow \mathfrak{c}_r]$' =
'$\varphi[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{c}}]$', hence $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\varphi[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{c}}] \to \forall \vec{z}\, \varphi$' □

7.3 Lemma Assume $\mathcal{T}'$ due to 7.1(4), $\quad \vec{\delta} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^{\ell} \quad \vec{u}, \vec{v} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\delta}} \quad$ '$\mathfrak{a}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\gamma}[\vec{u}]$ '$\mathfrak{b}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\gamma}[\vec{v}]$ and no component of $\vec{u}$ or $\vec{v}$ occurs more than once.
If $(\forall \vec{d} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\delta}}[]\,)\; \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a}[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{d}] = \mathfrak{b}[\vec{v} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$' and if $\vec{z} = \langle\, \text{'}z_i\text{'} \,\rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\delta}}$ is such that each 'z_i' is different from the members of $\vec{u}$ and $\vec{v}$ and neither occurs in '$\mathfrak{a}$' nor in '$\mathfrak{b}$', then $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\forall \vec{z}\, \mathfrak{a}[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{z}] = \mathfrak{b}[\vec{v} \leftarrow \vec{z}]$'

Proof. Let 's' = '$\mathfrak{a}[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{z}]$' and '$t$' = '$\mathfrak{b}[\vec{v} \leftarrow \vec{z}]$'. Our supposition for $\vec{z}$ implies that '$[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{z}][\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$' operates exactly like '$[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$', hence '$s[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$' = '$\mathfrak{a}[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$' and '$t[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$' = '$\mathfrak{b}[\vec{v} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$'. Premise $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a}[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{d}] = \mathfrak{b}[\vec{v} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$' then yields $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$t[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{d}] = s[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$', by 5.6 *def.* this is (*) $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$(t = s)[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$' for arbitrary $\vec{d} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\delta}}$. Now we are ready to use 7.2, the *lemma* that provides *special constants* $\vec{\mathfrak{c}} = \langle\, \text{'}\mathfrak{c}_j\text{'} \,\rangle_{j:1..\ell}$ (each '$\mathfrak{c}_j$' $\in \mathrm{COP}_{\delta_j}$) so that $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$(t = s)[\vec{z} \leftarrow \vec{\mathfrak{c}}] \;\to\; \forall \vec{z}\;\, t = s$', detachment with (*) yields $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\forall \vec{z}\;\, t = s$', recalling the definition of 's' and 't' this is $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\forall \vec{z}\;\, \mathfrak{b}[\vec{v} \leftarrow \vec{z}] = \mathfrak{a}[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{z}]$' □

7.4 Lemma Assume $\mathcal{T}'$ due to 7.1(4), $\mathsf{persp.GP}$ and $\mathsf{persp.GP}^{\star}$ with $\vec{u} = \vec{u^{\star}} = \langle\rangle$. $\mathsf{persp.GP}^{\star}$ denotes the change of all symbolic parameters except 'op', $\mathfrak{m}$ and r_i by appending a star-superscript performed on $\mathsf{persp.GP}$ (as new names for corresponding

but possibly different things are required).
If $(\forall\, i : 1\,..\,m\,)\ (\forall\, \vec{s} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\beta_i}}[\,]\,)\ \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a}_i^\star[\vec{\nu_i^\star} \leftarrow \vec{s}] = \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}]$' then $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$e^\star = e$'

Proof. Applying the preceding *lemma* to the last premise yields $(\forall\, i : 1\,..\,m)$ $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\forall\, \vec{z}\, \mathfrak{a}_i^\star[\vec{\nu_i^\star} \leftarrow \vec{z_i}] = \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{z_i}]$' (by appropriate choice of $\vec{z_i} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\beta_i}}$). Now we are ready to use *equality axioms* (page 14). Iterated application of (I2) yields the chain of equations $\mathrm{op}(P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_m) = \mathrm{op}(Q_1, P_2, \ldots, P_m) = \cdots = \mathrm{op}(Q_1, \ldots, Q_m)$ where 'P_i' = '$[(\vec{\nu_i^\star}){:}\,]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ \mathfrak{a}_i^\star$' and '$Q_i$' = '$[(\vec{\nu_i}){:}\,]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ \mathfrak{a}_i$'. From (I4) *transitivity* we obtain $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$L = R$' with 'L' = '$\mathrm{op}(P_1, \ldots, P_m)$' = '$\mathrm{op}(\ldots, [(\vec{\nu_i^\star}){:}\,]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ \mathfrak{a}_i^\star, \ldots)$' = '$e^\star$' and '$R$' = '$\mathrm{op}(Q_1, \ldots, Q_m)$' = '$\mathrm{op}(\ldots, [(\vec{\nu_i}){:}\,]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ \mathfrak{a}_i, \ldots)$' $\underset{5.6}{=}$ '$\mathrm{op}(\ldots, [(\vec{\nu_i}){:}\,]_{\text{if } r_i>0}\ \mathfrak{a}_i, \ldots)$' = '$e$', hence $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$e^\star = e$'. □

7.5 Definition (norm of closed expressions) Assume $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ S'$, $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^\pi_{S'}$. For each $\gamma \in \mathrm{SRT}$ and 'e' $\in \mathfrak{L}^\gamma_{S'}[\,] \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\,]$ the *norm* '$\underline{e}$' is defined as follows:

If $\gamma = \boldsymbol{\pi}$ then if $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ 'e' then '$\underline{e}$' = 'Υ' otherwise '$\underline{e}$' = 'λ'.
If $\gamma \neq \boldsymbol{\pi}$ then we rely on an ordinal enumeration of $\mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\,]$ and define '$\underline{e}$' to be the first within the subset $\{\,$'$\mathfrak{a}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\,] \mid \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a} \overset{\gamma}{=} e$'$\,\}$. w.r.t. this enumeration.

7.6 Proposition Let $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ S'$, $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^\pi_{S'}$, $\gamma \in \mathrm{SRT} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{\pi}\}$ and 'e', 'e_1', 'e_2' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\,]$ then (1) $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\underline{e} \overset{\gamma}{=} e$' (2) $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$e_1 \overset{\gamma}{=} e_2$' $\leftrightarrow$ '$\underline{e_1}$' = '$\underline{e_2}$'
(3) 'φ' $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[\,] \wedge \mathsf{Complete}_{S'}(\mathcal{T}') \rightarrow \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ 'φ' $\leftrightarrow$ '$\underline{\varphi}$' = 'Υ'

Proof. immediately from the preceding definition. □

7.7 Definition (term structure) Let $\mathcal{T}'$ be a *complete and consistent Henkin theory*, i.e. we presuppose the conditions of 7.1 except (1) for $\mathcal{T}'$. We define the *term structure* $\mathfrak{X}$ as a function on $\mathrm{SRT} \cup (\mathrm{SRT} \times \mathrm{VSRT}^*) \cup \mathrm{SOP}$. As we now consider only one *signature* (S', that of $\mathcal{T}'$ and do not refer to $\mathcal{T}$ and S) we shall omit subscript S'.

(1) ($\gamma \in \mathrm{SRT}$) $\mathfrak{X}(\gamma) \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \mathfrak{X}_\gamma = \{$'$\underline{e}$' | '$e$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\,]\}$

(2) ($\gamma \in \mathrm{SRT}$, $\vec{\sigma} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^*$) $\mathfrak{X}(\gamma, \vec{\sigma}) \overset{\text{alias}}{=} \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\sigma}}_\gamma =$

$$= \begin{cases} \mathfrak{X}^{\langle\rangle}_\gamma = \mathfrak{X}_\gamma & \text{if } l = 0 \\ \{f \mid (\exists\, \vec{u} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}})\ (\exists\, \text{'}e\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{u}]\,)\ f = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}(\vec{\sigma}) \rightarrow & \mathfrak{X}(\gamma) \\ \vec{c} \quad \mapsto & \text{'}\underline{e[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{c}]}\text{'} \end{bmatrix}\} & \text{if } l \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

(3) ('op' $\in \mathrm{SOP}$, sign'op' $= \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\vec{\beta}} \rangle$) If $m = 0$ $\mathfrak{X}$'op' = '$\underline{\mathrm{op}}$'

If $m \neq 0$ $\mathfrak{X}$'op' $= \{\langle \vec{\alpha},$ '$\underline{e}$'$\rangle \mid$ $\vec{\alpha} = \langle \mathfrak{a}_i \rangle_{i:1..m} \in \prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\beta_i}}_{\alpha_i} \wedge \exists\, \vec{\alpha}\ \exists\, \vec{\vec{\nu}}$ (i)-(iv)$\}$

(i) $\vec{\alpha} = \langle$ '$\mathfrak{a}_i$'$\rangle_i \in \prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}[\vec{\nu_i}]$ (ii) $\vec{\vec{\nu}} = \langle \vec{\nu_i} \rangle_i \in \prod_{i:1..m} \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\beta_i}}$

(iii) $(\forall\, i : 1\,..\,m\,)\;\; \mathfrak{a}_i = \begin{cases} \text{`}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i}\text{'} & \text{if } r_i = 0 \\ \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \mathfrak{X}(\vec{\beta}_i) & \to & \mathfrak{X}(\alpha_i) \\ \vec{b} & \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{v_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]}\text{'} \end{smallmatrix}\right] & \text{if } r_i \neq 0 \end{cases}$

(iv) $\text{`}e\text{'} = \text{`op}(\ldots, \underset{\text{if } r_i > 0}{[(\vec{v_i}):]}\ \mathfrak{a}_i, \ldots)\text{'}$

7.8 Remark (i)-(iv) in 7.7(3) imply persp.GP with $\vec{u} = \langle\rangle$

7.9 Proposition $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Structures}_S\ \mathfrak{X}$ (Def. s. 4.1 on page 7)

Proof. We show that the laws of Def. 4.1 on page 7 apply to $\mathfrak{X}$ (in place of $\mathfrak{M}$) referring to them with the numeration used in that definition. We rely on *lemmas* 5.7 to 5.11 and Def. 7.7 on page 20 of $\mathfrak{X}$. For (1) and (3.1) there is nothing to prove. Our first goal is to prove validity of (2), this only requires verification that $\mathfrak{X}$ 'op' is a function if $m \neq 0$. We refer to 7.7(3), case $m \neq 0$ (def. of $\mathfrak{X}$ 'op'). The *goal* is then reduced to the task of deduction from the *premises* $\langle \vec{a}, \text{`}\underline{e}\text{'}\rangle \in \mathfrak{X}\text{'op'}$, $\langle \vec{a^\star}, \text{`}\underline{e^\star}\text{'}\rangle \in \mathfrak{X}\text{'op'}$ and $\vec{a^\star} = \vec{a}$ to the *conclusion* $\text{`}\underline{e}\text{'} = \text{`}\underline{e^\star}\text{'}$. *Subproof (Sketch).* By expansion of 1^{st} and 2^{nd} premise according to 7.7(3)(case $m \neq 0$) we obtain (i)-(iv) of 7.7(3) and a starred isomorphic variant $(i)^\star - (iv)^\star$. By 7.8 *remark* we succeed to persp.GP and persp.GP* with $\vec{u} = \vec{u^\star} = \langle\rangle$. Still one condition lacks to use 7.4 *lemma*. From *premise* $\vec{a^\star} = \vec{a}$ and expanding (iii) of 7.7(3) we obtain *equations* $\text{`}\underline{a_i^\star[\vec{v_i^\star} \leftarrow \vec{b}]}\text{'} = \text{`}\underline{a_i[\vec{v_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]}\text{'}$ for each $\vec{b} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\beta_i}}$. These *equations* can be transformed into theorems of $\mathcal{T}'$ according to 7.6(2) and then generalized by 7.6(1) to apply to each $\vec{b} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\beta_i}}[]$, so that finally 7.4 can be used to deduce $\mathcal{T}' \vdash \text{`}e^\star = e\text{'}$. To present this in detail: 7.6(2) yields $\mathcal{T}' \vdash \text{`}a_i^\star[\vec{v_i^\star} \leftarrow \vec{b}] = a_i[\vec{v_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]\text{'}$ for $\vec{b} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\beta_i}}$. Taking into account, that $\text{`}d_j\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\beta_{i\,j}}[]$ implies $\text{`}\underline{d_j}\text{'} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\beta_{i\,j}}$ we obtain $(\forall\, \vec{d} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\vec{\beta_i}})\ \mathcal{T}' \vdash \text{`}a_i^\star[\vec{v_i^\star} \leftarrow \vec{\underline{d}}] = a_i[\vec{v_i} \leftarrow \vec{\underline{d}}]\text{'}$. Referring to 7.6(1): $\mathcal{T}' \vdash \text{`}\underline{d_j} = d_j\text{'}$ by virtue of 5.16 *corollary (equality rule)* on page 15 we may replace each $\text{`}\underline{d_j}\text{'}$ by $\text{`}d_j\text{'}$, hence $\vec{\underline{d}}$ by $\vec{d}$ and are ready to apply 7.4, that yields $\mathcal{T}' \vdash \text{`}e^\star = e\text{'}$ and by 7.6(2) $\text{`}\underline{e^\star}\text{'} = \text{`}\underline{e}\text{'}$ $\square$(2). We turn to the *completion qualities.* Next goal is (3.2 a) $\mathrm{cst}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\gamma}$ for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{X}_\gamma$. *Subproof.* Suppose $\mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{X}_\gamma$, then (applying (1) of 7.7) $\mathbf{w} = \text{`}\underline{e}\text{'}$ for some $\text{`}e\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[]$, by 5.3 on page 10 $\mathrm{frV}\,\text{`}e\text{'} = \varnothing$, hence by 5.7 on page 11 $\text{`}e\text{'} = \text{`}e[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{c}]\text{'}$, then $\mathrm{cst}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\mathbf{w}} = \mathrm{cst}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\text{`}\underline{e}\text{'}} = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} & \to & \mathfrak{X}_\gamma \\ \vec{c} & \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{e[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{c}]}\text{'} \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, that is $\mathrm{cst}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\gamma}$ due to (2) of 7.7 Def. $\square$(3.2 a). Next goal is (3.2 b) $\mathrm{pj}^{\vec{\sigma}}_j = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathfrak{X}\sigma_j \\ \vec{c} & \mapsto & \text{`}c_j\text{'} \end{smallmatrix}\right] \in \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\sigma_j}$.
Subproof. Let $\vec{c} = \langle \text{`}c_i\text{'}\rangle_{i:1..l}$. If we apply 5.6 Def., case $m = 0$, $\text{`op'} \in \lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor$, perform a substitution such that the second *condition of case* changes into $\text{`}u_j\text{'} \in \lfloor \vec{u} \rfloor$ and use $\text{`}c_j\text{'} = \text{`}\underline{c_j}\text{'}$ (as $\text{`}c_j\text{'} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\sigma_j} \subseteq \{\,\text{`}\underline{e}\text{'} \mid \text{`}e\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_{\sigma_j}\}$), then we obtain $\mathrm{pj}^{\vec{\sigma}}_j = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\vec{\sigma} & \to & \mathfrak{X}\sigma_j \\ \vec{c} & \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{u_j[\vec{u} \leftarrow \vec{c}]}\text{'} \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. This matches the pattern of 7.7 (2) for $\mathrm{pj}^{\vec{\sigma}}_j \in \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\sigma_j}$ $\square$(3.2 b). Next goal is
(3.3) $\vec{c} = \langle \text{`}c_i\text{'}\rangle_i \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} \;\wedge\; \mathbf{g} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\sigma}\vec{\rho}}_{\gamma} \;\to\; \mathbf{g}_{\vec{c}} \in \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\rho}}_{\gamma}$. *Subproof.* Applying 7.7 we can

replace the 2nd premise by $\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\vec{\sigma}\vec{\rho} \to & \mathfrak{X}_\gamma \\ \vec{c}\vec{d} \mapsto & \text{`}e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{d}]\text{'} \end{bmatrix}$. If we replace $\mathbf{g}$ in (3.3) by the right hand term, it only remains to show: if $\vec{x} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}}$, $\vec{y} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\rho}}$, '$e$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{x}\vec{y}]$ and $\vec{c} = \langle \text{`}c_i\text{'} \rangle_{i:1..\ell(\sigma)} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}}$, then $\mathbf{g}_{\vec{c}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\vec{\rho} \to & \mathfrak{X}_\gamma \\ \vec{d} \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{d}]}\text{'} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{X}_\gamma^{\vec{\rho}}$. The expression for $\mathbf{g}_{\vec{c}}$ must be transformed in such a manner that it matches the pattern of $\mathbf{f}$ in 7.7(2) on p. 20. This is achieved by aid of *lemma* 5.9 : '$e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{d}]$' = '$e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{y}][\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{d}]$'. Substitution yields $\mathbf{g}_{\vec{c}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\vec{\rho} \to & \mathfrak{X}_\gamma \\ \vec{d} \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{e[\vec{x}\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{y}][\vec{y} \leftarrow \vec{d}]}\text{'} \end{bmatrix}$. According to 7.7 (2) then $\mathbf{g}_{\vec{c}} \in \mathfrak{X}_\gamma^{\vec{\rho}}$ $\square$(3.3).

Next we show (3.4). *Outline:* It requires inheritance of the quality $\mathfrak{X}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$ of a map $\mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} \to \mathfrak{X}_\gamma$, when composition of such maps with $\mathfrak{X}$'op' due to 4.1 *definition* (3.4) (p. 7) is performed. Quality $\mathfrak{X}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$ applies to $\mathbf{h}\colon \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} \to \mathfrak{X}_\gamma$ iff $\mathbf{h}$ can be defined by an expression 'e' as a substitution mapping $\vec{c} \mapsto \text{`}\underline{e[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}]}\text{'}$. To show this *inheritance* we start from 7.7(3), compare the terms that arise with those obtained from quality $\mathfrak{X}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\sigma}\vec{\nu_i}}$ applied to $\mathbf{h}_i\vec{c}$. The goal that the composed map $\vec{c} \mapsto \mathfrak{X}\text{`op'}(\dots, \mathbf{h}_i\vec{c}, \dots)$ belongs to $\mathfrak{X}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$ is achieved if we find an '$e$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma$ so that $\mathfrak{X}\text{`op'}(\dots, \mathbf{h}_i\vec{c}, \dots) = \text{`}\underline{e[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}]}\text{'}$. The solution will be quite natural 'e' = '$\mathrm{op}(\dots, \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{\nu_i})\colon]}\ a_i, \dots)$'.

Subproof of (3.4). From the premises (p1)-(p4) we infer (—) below.

(p1) $m > 0$, $\ell > 0$ (p2) 'op' $\in \mathrm{SOP}$, sign'op' $= \langle \gamma, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \rangle$

Letter i is understood to be bound by $(\forall\, i : 1\,..\,m)$ ... in subsequent context.

(p3) $\mathbf{g}_i \in \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\sigma}\vec{\beta_i}}$, that is owing to 7.7 (2), case $\ell > 0$:

$$\mathbf{g}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\vec{\sigma}\vec{\beta_i} \to & \mathfrak{X}\alpha_i \\ \vec{c}\vec{\beta_i} \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{a_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{b_i}]}\text{'} \end{bmatrix} \text{ with } a_i \in \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i}]$$

(p4) if $r_i = 0$ then $\mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{g}_i$ else $\mathbf{h}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} \to & \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha_i}^{\vec{\beta_i}} \\ \vec{c} \mapsto & \mathbf{g}_{i\vec{c}} \end{bmatrix}$ where $\mathbf{g}_{i\vec{c}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\beta_i \to & \mathfrak{X}\alpha_i \\ \vec{b_i} \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{a_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{b_i}]}\text{'} \end{bmatrix}$.

Our goal is to show (—) $\begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}\vec{\sigma} \to & \mathfrak{X}_\gamma \\ \vec{c} \mapsto & \mathfrak{X}\text{`op'}(\dots, \mathbf{h}_i\vec{c}, \dots) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{X}_\gamma^{\vec{\sigma}}$. We now turn to conclusions from (p1-p4).

(p5) '$a_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{b_i}]$' = '$a_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{\nu_i}][\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{b_i}]$' (according to 5.9 *lemma*).

From p4+p5 we infer

(p6) $\mathbf{h}_i\vec{c} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_i\vec{c} = \text{`}\underline{a_i[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}]}\text{'} & \text{if } r_i = 0 \\ \mathbf{g}_{i\vec{c}}\colon \vec{b_i} \mapsto \text{`}\underline{a_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{b_i}][\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{b_i}]}\text{'} & \text{if } r_i \neq 0 \end{cases}$

In order to verify (—) we look at 7.7 (2) Def. $\mathfrak{X}$. It requires transforming of $\mathfrak{X}$'op'(..., $\mathbf{h}_i\vec{c}$, ...) into an expression of shape '$\underline{\mathrm{op}(..., ?, ...)}$'. This can be achieved by application of 7.7 (3) if we find a substitute of '?' so that $\mathfrak{X}$'op'(..., $\mathbf{h}_i\vec{c}$, ...) = '$\underline{\mathrm{op}(...?...)}$'. We have to show (——) $\langle \langle \mathbf{h}_i\vec{c} \rangle_{i:1..m}$, '$\underline{\mathrm{op}(...?...)}$'$\rangle \in \mathfrak{X}$'op' for some '?'. We observe the following correspondence of terms in 7.7 (3) and those from our current *Situation*:

		(if $r_i = 0$)	(if $r_i > 0$)	
7.7(3):	$\vec{a}$	'$\underline{a_i}$'	'$\underline{a_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]}$'	'$\mathrm{op}(\dots, \underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{\nu_i})\colon]}\ a_i, \dots)$'
Situation:	$\mathbf{h}_i\vec{c}$	'$\underline{a_i[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}]}$'	'$\underline{a_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{b_i}]}$'	'$\mathrm{op}(\dots, ?, \dots)$'

This makes evident what to be substituted for '?' in (——): only '$\underset{\text{if } r_i>0}{[(\vec{\nu_i})\colon]}\ a_i[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}]$'

may be considered. The problem is now reduced to showing

$$(\text{———}) \qquad (\text{for } \mathfrak{r}_i > 0 \quad \vec{c} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} \quad \vec{b_i} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\beta_i}}) \quad \text{`}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{c}\vec{b_i}]}\text{'} = \text{`}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{c}][\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{b_i}]}\text{'}$$

As $\mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_\sigma[]$, this equation is supplied by 5.11 *lemma*, but only if $\lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor \cap \lfloor \vec{\nu_i} \rfloor = \varnothing$. We can achieve this requirement by renaming the variables $\vec{\nu_i}$ using *equality axioms* (I2) of 5.12 on page 14, namely the following instance:

$$\text{(p7)} \quad \forall \vec{w_i} \;\; \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{w_i}] = \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{q_i}][\vec{q_i} \leftarrow \vec{w_i}] \;\rightarrow$$
$$\rightarrow \; \mathrm{op}(\Delta, \underset{\text{if } \mathfrak{r}_i > 0}{[(\vec{\nu_i}) \colon]} \; \mathfrak{a}_i, \Gamma) = \mathrm{op}(\Delta, \underset{\text{if } \mathfrak{r}_i > 0}{[(\vec{q_i}) \colon]} \; \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{q_i}], \Gamma)$$

(in place of '$\mathfrak{b}_i$' at 5.12 now '$\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{q_i}]$'). If we choose $\vec{w_i}$ and $\vec{q_i}$ so that the variables of the sequences $\vec{\nu_i}$, $\vec{w_i}$ and $\vec{q_i}$ are pairwise disjoint, then also '$\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{w_i}]$' = '$\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{q_i}][\vec{q_i} \leftarrow \vec{w_i}]$' and the antecedent of p7 can be detached on account of *axiom* (I1). We are now supplied with

$$\vdash_{\overline{\mathcal{T}'}} \text{`}\mathrm{op}(\Delta, \underset{\text{if } \mathfrak{r}_i > 0}{[(\vec{\nu_i}) \colon]} \; \mathfrak{a}_i, \Gamma) = \mathrm{op}(\Delta, \underset{\text{if } \mathfrak{r}_i > 0}{[(\vec{q_i}) \colon]} \; \mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{q_i}], \Gamma)\text{'}$$

and due to 7.6(2): $\vdash_{\overline{\mathcal{T}'}}$ '$\mathfrak{e}_1 = \mathfrak{e}_2$' $\leftrightarrow$ '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}_1}$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}_2}$' we can interchange the two terms (left and right side of equation) within the considered context and the requirement for applicability of 5.11 will be provided. Hence without loss of generality we can assume the required condition for $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{\nu_i}$, too. This confirms (———) and through the chain (!!!) $\rightarrow$ (!!), (!!) $\rightarrow$ (!) we succeed to (—). $\square$(3.4) To check (4) of 4.1 Def. that $\mathfrak{X}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ is a Boolen algebra with two elements, whose operations are the $\mathfrak{X}$-values of certain logical connectives: this can be seen from 7.7 Def. of *term structure* together with 7.5 Def. of *norm* and simple instances of propositional tautologies as e.g. '$\curlywedge \vee \curlyvee \overset{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{=} \curlyvee$' (note '$\overset{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{=}$' is '$\leftrightarrow$'). Finally check (5): From 7.7 Def. $\mathfrak{X}$, special case 'op' = '$\overset{\gamma}{=}$', only to consider case $\mathfrak{r}_i = 0$, we obtain $\mathfrak{X}$'$\overset{\gamma}{=}$'('$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_1}$', '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_2}$') = '$\mathfrak{a}_1 \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a}_2$' and have to show '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_1 \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a}_2}$' = '$\curlyvee$' if '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_1}$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_2}$' otherwise = '$\curlywedge$'. This follows from 7.6(2) '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_1}$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_2}$' iff $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a}_1 \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a}_2$' and 7.6(1) ... iff '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_1 \overset{\gamma}{=} \mathfrak{a}_2}$' = '$\curlyvee$'. $\square$

7.10 Theorem Assume $\mathfrak{X}$ is the *term structure* of $\mathcal{T}'$ due to Def. 7.7, $\vec{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in \mathrm{VSRT}^\ell$, $\vec{x} = \langle \text{`}\mathfrak{x}_i\text{'} \rangle_{i:1..\ell} \in \mathrm{VAR}_{\vec{\sigma}}$, then

$$(\;\text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'} \in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{x}]\;) \quad \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x}) = \begin{cases} \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\mathfrak{X}}() = \text{`}\underline{\mathfrak{e}}\text{'} & \text{if } \ell = 0 \\ \left[\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} & \rightarrow & \mathfrak{X}_\gamma \\ \vec{s} & \mapsto & \text{`}\underline{\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}\text{'} \end{array}\right] & \text{if } \ell \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Proof. We assume '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{x}]$ and persp.GP (ref. 4.5 on page 9, 7.7 and 4.6 on page 9), w.r.t. 4.6 substitute '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})$ for '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{M}}(\vec{u})$).
Case $\ell = 0$: Can be treated like the other case. *Case* $\ell \neq 0$: The goal is to show

$$(\text{—}) \qquad \text{`}\mathfrak{e}\text{'}_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})(\vec{s}) = \text{`}\underline{\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}\text{'} \quad \text{for } \vec{s} \in \mathfrak{X}_\sigma \qquad (\text{note that } \mathfrak{X}_\sigma \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_\sigma[])$$

We shall evaluate the left side of the equation according to 4.6 Def. of *interpretation* and the right side due to 5.6 and utilize from the *induction premise* that the law to be shown already applies to the argument terms '$\mathfrak{a}_i$' until *left = right* becomes evident.

Case $\mathfrak{m} = 0$: From '$\mathfrak{e}$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_\gamma[\vec{x}]$, by 4.5 on page 9, 5.1 on page 10 and the supposed persp.GP we obtain '$\mathfrak{e}$' = 'op' $\in$ Sop $\cup \lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor$. First consider case '$\mathfrak{e}$' = 'op' $\in \lfloor \vec{x} \rfloor$. *left:* According to 4.6 (Def. *interpretation*) '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})(\vec{s}) = \mathrm{pj}^{\vec{\sigma}}_k$ = '$\mathfrak{s}_k$'. *right:* 5.6 yields '$\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]$' = '$\mathfrak{s}_k$'. For both *left* and *right* k is defined to be the biggest so that '$\mathfrak{x}_k$' = '$\mathfrak{e}$'. '$\mathfrak{s}_k$' $\in \mathfrak{X}_{\sigma_k}$ implies '$\mathfrak{s}_k$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{s}_k}$', hence '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}$' = '$\mathfrak{s}_k$'. (—) is evident. Now consider the other case '$\mathfrak{e}$' = 'op' $\in$ Sop. *left:* by 4.6 '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x}) = \mathrm{cst}^{\vec{\sigma}}_{\mathfrak{X}\text{'op'}}$, then '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})(\vec{s}) = \mathfrak{X}$'op' $\underset{7.7(3)}{=}$ '$\underline{\mathrm{op}}$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}}$' *right:* by 5.6 '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}$' = '$\underline{\mathrm{op}}$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}}$'

Case $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$: We rely on our *induction hypothesis:* '$\mathfrak{a}_i$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i})(\vec{s}\vec{b_i})$ = '$\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}\vec{b_i}]}$' and observe '$\mathfrak{e}$' = 'op$(\ldots, \underset{\text{if } r_i > 0}{[(\vec{\nu_i}) :]}\ \mathfrak{a}_i, \ldots)$'. *right:* '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}$'. *left:* According to 4.6 (Def. *interpretation*) '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x}) = \mathfrak{X}$'op'$(\langle \mathbf{h}_i \vec{s} \rangle_{i:1..m})$ with $\mathbf{h}_i \colon \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}} \to \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha_i}$, so that for arbitrary $\vec{s} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}}$

$$\text{if } r_i = 0 \text{ then } \mathbf{h}_i = \text{'}\mathfrak{a}_i\text{'}_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})(\vec{s}) \qquad \text{else} \quad \mathbf{h}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\beta_i}} & \to & \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha_i} \\ \vec{b} & \mapsto & \text{'}\mathfrak{a}_i\text{'}_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i})(\vec{s}\vec{b}) \end{bmatrix}$$

induction hypothesis yields

$$\text{(i)} \qquad \text{if } r_i = 0 \text{ then } \mathbf{h}_i = \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}\text{'} \qquad \text{else} \quad \mathbf{h}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\beta_i}} & \to & \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha_i} \\ \vec{b} & \mapsto & \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}\vec{b}]}\text{'} \end{bmatrix}$$

In order to apply 7.7(Def. $\mathfrak{X}$) we transform the equation next to label "*left:* " into $\langle \langle \mathbf{h}_i \vec{s} \rangle_{i:1..m}$, '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})(\vec{s})\rangle \in \mathfrak{X}$'op' and in order to distinguish already used symbols (meta variables) from corresponding ones that may denote different objects we supply the one with star as superscript. Applying 7.7(3) in this way we obtain $\mathfrak{X}$'op': $\prod_{i:1..m} \mathfrak{X}^{\vec{\beta_i}}_{\alpha_i} \to \mathfrak{X}_\gamma$ and that there are $\vec{\mathfrak{a}^\star}$, $\overset{\Rightarrow}{\nu^\star}$, '$\mathfrak{e}^\star$' so that $\overset{\Rightarrow}{\nu^\star} = \langle \vec{\nu^\star_i} \rangle_{i:1..m}$, $\vec{\mathfrak{a}^\star} = \langle \text{'}\mathfrak{a}^\star_i\text{'} \rangle_{i:1..m}$, each $\vec{\nu^\star_i} \in \mathrm{Var}_{\vec{\beta_i}}$, each '$\mathfrak{a}^\star_i$' $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}[\vec{\nu^\star_i}]$ and (as $\langle \mathbf{h}_i \rangle_i$ substitutes $\vec{\mathfrak{a}}$)

$$\text{(ii)} \qquad \text{if } r_i = 0 \text{ then } \mathbf{h}_i(\vec{s}) = \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}^\star_i}\text{' else } \mathbf{h}_i(\vec{s}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\beta_i}} & \to & \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha_i} \\ \vec{b} & \mapsto & \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}^\star_i[\vec{\nu^\star_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]}\text{'} \end{bmatrix},$$

finally '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}^\star}$' = 'op$(\ldots, \underset{\text{if } r_i > 0}{\overline{[(\vec{\nu^\star_i}) :]}}\ \mathfrak{a}^\star_i, \ldots)$' and '$\mathfrak{e}$'$_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})(\vec{s})$ = '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}^\star}$'. Note that each starred metavariable depends on parameter $\vec{s}$. Our *goal* is to deduce '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}^\star}$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}$'. To achieve it we try to obtain the premises suited for an application of 7.4 *lemma*. Combining (i)+(ii) yields

$$\text{if } r_i = 0 \text{ then } \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}\text{'} = \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}^\star_i}\text{' else } (\forall\, \vec{b} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\beta_i}}\,)\ \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}\vec{b}]}\text{'} = \text{'}\underline{\mathfrak{a}^\star_i[\vec{\nu^\star_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]}\text{'}$$

Note that case $r_i = 0$ can be treated like the other case, as '$\mathfrak{a}^\star_i[\langle\rangle \leftarrow \langle\rangle]$' = '$\mathfrak{a}^\star_i$' is stipulated by 5.6 *def.*, 7.6 yields $\mathcal{T}' \vdash$ '$\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}\vec{b}] = \mathfrak{a}^\star_i[\vec{\nu^\star_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]$',
by 5.9 '$\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}\vec{b}]$' = '$\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}\vec{\nu_i}][\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]$' hence

$$\text{(iii)} \qquad (\forall\, \vec{b} \in \mathfrak{X}_\beta\,) \quad \mathcal{T}' \vdash \text{'}\mathfrak{a}_i[\vec{x}\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{s}\vec{\nu_i}][\vec{\nu_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}] = \mathfrak{a}^\star_i[\vec{\nu^\star_i} \leftarrow \vec{b}]\text{'}$$

This is the prerequisite for applying 7.4 which yields the required '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}^\star}$' = '$\underline{\mathfrak{e}[\vec{x} \leftarrow \vec{s}]}$'. □

7.11 Observation $\mathfrak{X}$'$\curlyvee$' = '$\curlyvee$' $= \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ $\qquad$ $\mathfrak{X}$'$\curlywedge$' = '$\curlywedge$' $= \mathbf{0}_{\mathfrak{B}}$

7.12 Observation If $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$, ‘φ’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ then $\mathcal{T} \vdash$ ‘$\forall \vec{x}\ \varphi$’ $\leftrightarrow\ \mathcal{T} \vdash$ ‘φ’

7.13 Theorem Assume the premises as in 7.10, let $\gamma = \boldsymbol{\pi}$ and ‘φ’ $\in \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}[\vec{x}]$, then

(1) $\quad \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ ‘φ’ $\leftrightarrow$ ‘$\underline{\varphi}'_{\mathfrak{X}}() =$ ‘Υ’ $= \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ $\qquad$ if $\mathfrak{n} = 0$

(2) $\quad \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ ‘φ’ $\leftrightarrow$ $(\forall\, \vec{a} \in \mathfrak{X}_{\vec{\sigma}}\,)$ ‘$\underline{\varphi}'_{\mathfrak{X}}(\vec{x})(\vec{a}) =$ ‘Υ’ $= \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ $\qquad$ if $\mathfrak{n} \neq 0$

(3) $\quad \mathcal{T}' \vdash$ ‘φ’ $\leftrightarrow\ \mathfrak{X} \models\!\!\models_{S'}$ ‘φ’ $\qquad$ $(\mathfrak{n} \geq 0)$

Proof. The two preceding *observations* and application of 7.10 and 7.6 yield this result. □

7.14 Observation Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a consistent theory and $\mathcal{T}'$ its extension due to 7.1 on page 18 (*extension theorem*). If $\mathfrak{X}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}'$ then the restriction $S \restriction \mathfrak{X}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ to the *signature* $S \sqsubseteq S'$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$, that is: $\quad \mathfrak{X} \models\!\!\models_{S'} \mathcal{T}' \ \rightarrow\ S \restriction \mathfrak{X} \models\!\!\models_{S} \mathcal{T}$

7.15 Completeness Theorem (2nd Version) A consistent Fnl^1 *theory* has a model.

$$\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ \ S\ \wedge\ \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\ \wedge\ \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T})\ \rightarrow\ (\exists\, \mathfrak{M}\, \mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Structure}\,)\ \mathfrak{M} \models\!\!\models_{S} \mathcal{T}$$

Proof. This is a consequence of 7.1,7.7,7.13,7.14 according to 6.10. □

7.16 Completeness Theorem (Gödel) Any formula that is valid in a Fnl^1 *theory* is provable in it, that is $\mathsf{Fnl}^1\ \mathsf{Signat}\ \ S\ \wedge\ \mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\varphi\text{’}\,\} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\ \wedge\ \mathcal{T} \models\!\!\models_{S}$ ‘φ’ $\rightarrow\ \mathcal{T} \vdash_{S}$ ‘φ’

Proof. $\mathcal{T} \models\!\!\models_{S}$ ‘φ’ iff $\mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\neg\varphi\text{’}\,\}$ has no model

$\mathcal{T} \vdash_{S}$ ‘φ’ iff $\neg\, \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\neg\varphi\text{’}\,\})$

Use 7.15 with $\mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\neg\varphi\text{’}\,\}$ in place of $\mathcal{T}$, then the first 2 premises of the theorem imply

$$\mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\neg\varphi\text{’}\,\}) \rightarrow (\exists\, \mathfrak{M}\,)\ \mathfrak{M} \models\!\!\models_{S} \mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\neg\varphi\text{’}\,\}$$

$$\neg\, (\exists\, \mathfrak{M}\,)\ \mathfrak{M} \models\!\!\models_{S} \mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\neg\varphi\text{’}\,\} \rightarrow \neg\, \mathsf{Consistent}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\,\text{‘}\neg\varphi\text{’}\,\}) \qquad \text{by } \textit{propositional tautology}$$

$$\mathcal{T} \models\!\!\models_{S} \text{‘}\varphi\text{’} \rightarrow \mathcal{T} \vdash_{S} \text{‘}\varphi\text{’} \qquad \text{according to the first two lines of the proof}$$

□

Remarks. The construction of a *term model* could be carried out also with a theory $\mathcal{T}'$, if the requirement of 6.9 on page 17 (or 7.1 on page 18 respectively) is weakened by rewriting $\textsc{Cop}^{\gamma}_{S'}$ into $\mathfrak{L}^{\gamma}_{S'}[]$ (note that $\textsc{Cop}^{\gamma}_{S'} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}^{\gamma}_{S'}[]$). We then say $\mathcal{T}'$ *admits examples*. If we prove the validity of *Hilbert's 2nd ε-Theorem* for *Functional Logic*, which claims $\mathcal{T}'$ to be a *conservative extension* of $\mathcal{T}$, if the new symbols are ε_{γ} with signature ‘$\gamma((\gamma) : \boldsymbol{\pi})$’ for each $\gamma \in \textsc{VSrt}$ and the additional *axioms* are (ε_0) and (ε_2) as defined in [LEI69] (but actually multiplied by indexing range VSRT), then $\mathcal{T}'$ *admits examples* and inherits *consistency* from $\mathcal{T}$. We observe that

(ε_2) $\forall z(\varphi_z^x \leftrightarrow \psi_z^y) \rightarrow \varepsilon x.\varphi = \varepsilon y.\psi$ is accurately the *equality ax.* (I2) for the symbol 'ε' = 'ε_ξ' (see p. 14 and remember that '$\leftrightarrow$' is the same as '$\overset{\pi}{=}$').

(ε_0) $\exists x\ \varphi \rightarrow \varphi[x \leftarrow \varepsilon x.\varphi]$ is a nonlogical axiom, which makes $\mathfrak{T}'$ admit examples.

Thus $\mathfrak{T}'$ with only one new symbol for each $\gamma \in \text{VSRT}$ would be equally suitable for constructing a term model. Yet proving *Hilbert's 2nd ε-Theorem* (ref. to [LEI69]) for this purpose is considerably more difficult and largescale than Henkins approach.

References

[ASS57] G. ASSER. Theorie der logischen Auswahlfunktionen. *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 3:30–68, 1957.

[BAR77] Jon BARWISE. An Introduction to First-Order Logic. In *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*, volume 90 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, chapter 4. The Completeness Theorem, pages 22–40. North-Holland, 1977.

[CHR93] C. CHRISTIAN. Allgemeiner Korrektheits uns Vollständigkeitssatz für maximal konsistente Kalküle. *Sitzungsberichte der Österr. Akademie d. Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-naturwissensch. Klasse, II*, Bd. 202, Heft 1-10:23–45, 1993.

[GÖD30] Kurt GÖDEL. Die Vollständigkeit der Axiome des logischen Funktionenkalküls. *Monatshefte für Mathematik u. Physik*, 37:349–360, 1930.

[HB44] HILBERT, D. and BERNAIS, P. Die Grundlagen der Mathematik. *Berlin (Reprinted Ann Arbor. Mich.)*, 1,2, 1934,1939,(1944).

[HEN49] Leon HENKIN. The completeness of the first-order functional calculus. *J. Symb. Logic*, 13:159–166, 1949.

[HIL23] D. HILBERT. Die logischen Grundlagen der Mathematik. *Mathematische Annalen*, 88:151–165, 1923.

[HIL28] D. HILBERT. Die Grundlagen der Mathematik. *Abh. Math. Seminar Hamburg*, 6:65–85, 1928.

[KEI70] H.J. KEISLER. Logic with the quantifier "there exist uncountably many". *Ann. Math. Logic*, 1:1–93, 1970.

[LEI69] A.C. LEISENRING. *Mathem. Logic and Hilbert's Epsilon-Symbol*. MACDONALD & CO, London W.1, 1969.

[RAS56] H. RASIOWA. On the ε-theorems. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 43, 1956.

[SHO67] J.R. SHOENFIELD. *Mathematical Logic*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1967.